DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 632 UD 019 855

AUTHOR	McDonnell, Lorraine M.; Zellman, Gail L.
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Nonprofit Organization Program: Vol. III, The Role of Community Organizations in Facilitating School Desegregation.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	R-2312-3-HEW
PUB DATE	Oct 78
CONTRACT	300-76-0311
NOTE	141p.; For related documents, see ED 161 998, UD 019 854 and UD 019 856
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Attitudes; *Community Organizations; Community Support; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Group Activities; Integration Effects; Minority Group Children; *National Surveys; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Resources; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS	*Emergency School Aid Act 1972

ABSTRACT

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) provides financial assistance to nonprofit organizations (NPOs) to support school desegregation programs or reduce minority group isolation. In this volume the effectiveness of ESAA-NPOs and non-ESAA-funded groups is examined. The analysis, based on data from 131 community organizations in 40 school districts throughout the country, addresses two questions: (1) What are the most important factors in predicting the impact a community will have on facilitating school desegregation? (2) How does the impact of groups funded under the ESAA-NPO program compare with that of non-ESAA-funded groups? It was found that a group's choice of tactics and activities, rather than its community context or level of resources, best explain its impact in a given community. However, although advocacy activities were discovered to be the most important predictors of organizational success for types of groups, very few NPOs actually selected this type activity. In addition, neither the size, racial composition, nor openness to community inputs of a school district were found to affect the resource level or kinds of activities a group chooses, implying that other variables should be considered in awarding ESAA-NPO grants. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178632

AN EVALUATION OF THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION PROGRAM: VOL. III, THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN FACILITATING SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

LORRAINE M. McDONNELL AND GAIL L. ZELLMAN
WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF M. STEPHEN WEATHERFORD

R-2312/3-HEW
OCTOBER 1978

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406

UD019855

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 300-76-0311 with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Views or conclusions contained in this study should not be interpreted as representing the official opinion or policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data (Revised)
Main entry under title:

An Evaluation of the Emergency school aid act nonprofit organization program.

([Report] - Rand Corporation ; R-2312/ -HEW)
CONTENTS: v. 2. Crocker, S., Sperlich, P.W. with Oliver, L.P. A description of local program operations.--
--McDonnell, L.M., Zellman, G.L., Weatherford, M.S. The role of community organizations in facilitating school desegregation.
1. Discrimination in education--United States. 2. School integration--United States. 3. Discrimination in education--Law and legislation--United States. I. Title. II. Series: Rand Corporation. Rand Report ; R-2312/ -HEW.
AS36.R3 R-2312/2, etc. [LC212.2] 081s
ISBN 0-8330-0066-7 (v. 3) 370.19'342'0973 78-16701

Published by The Rand Corporation

PREFACE

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) of 1972 authorizes grants or contracts to any nonprofit organization other than a Local Education Agency to support school desegregation programs or reduce minority group isolation or its effects. The Nonprofit Organization (NPO) program under ESAA is a small component of generalized assistance to school desegregation. NPOs are funded on the assumption that certain activities relating to school desegregation can be effectively performed by organizations outside the regular school district structure.

This report is Vol. III of four volumes presenting Rand's evaluation of the NPO program, conducted for the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation (OPBE) of the U.S. Office of Education under Contract No. 300-76-0311. All volumes have the common title, *An Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Nonprofit Organization Program.* The four volumes in the series are titled as follows:

Vol. I, An Analysis of Federal Program Implementation and Funding Procedures, J. Kimbrough and J. Hyman, R-2312/1-HEW.

Vol. II, A Description of Local Program Operations, S. Crocker and P. W. Sperlich, R-2312/2-HEW.

Vol. III, The Role of Community Organizations in Facilitating School Desegregation, L. McDonnell and G. Zellman, R-2312/3-HEW.

Vol. IV, Conclusions and Policy Recommendations, S. Crocker and J. Kimbrough, R-2312/4-HEW.

Volume I examines the legislative and programmatic history of the ESAA-NPO program and analyzes the grant awards process for NPOs. Volume II describes NPO activities at the school district level. Volume III compares the effectiveness of ESAA-NPOs and non-ESAA-funded groups. Volume IV summarizes study findings and presents specific policy recommendations.

This volume is addressed to NPO personnel, to federal agency and school district personnel associated with the NPO program, and to education professionals interested in the role of community organizations in facilitating school desegregation.

SUMMARY

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Nonprofit Organization program funds community-based organizations working to facilitate school desegregation or to reduce the effects of minority isolation. The program funds nonprofit organizations (NPOs) on the assumption that certain activities are better performed by people and organizations outside the regular school district structure. To evaluate the performance of these organizations and to provide information for use in considering alternative funding award criteria, this study focused on two research questions:

- What are the most important factors in predicting the impact a community organization will have on facilitating school desegregation?
- How does the impact of groups funded under the ESAA-NPO program compare with that of non-ESAA-funded groups?

We assumed that this comparison would allow federal policymakers to identify the types of groups most likely to produce a large impact in their own communities. This information could then be used in modifying present award criteria and in funding the groups most likely to have the greatest impact.

The analysis is based on interview and record data collected on 131 community organizations located in 40 school districts throughout the country. Fifty-nine (45 percent) of the groups received ESAA-NPO funds during FY 1977. The sample represents a broad spectrum of groups ranging from elite business and civic groups to civil rights organizations and small neighborhood groups. These organizations engage in three main types of activities:

- Educational services such as tutoring, counseling on suspensions and expulsions, and the provision of extracurricular activities.

- o Advocacy activities such as dissemination of information, efforts to increase community influence in school district decisionmaking, and attempts to affect site selection or school closings.
- o Desegregation-specific activities such as filing suit against the school district, attempts to influence the content or timing of a desegregation plan, and attempts to reduce white flight.

To compare ESAA-funded NPOs with other community organizations involved in school desegregation we constructed an impact score to measure the amount of change a group brought about in its own community. The impact score included three components: the type and scope of change a group brought about, the stage of implementation of the change, and whether or not the change facilitated desegregation or reduced the effects of minority isolation.

Field staff and coders used strict rules of evidence in assessing a group's impact. Although the usual quantitative measures of output such as achievement test data were generally unavailable or inappropriate, highly visible indicators such as the establishment of new programs or an increase in parental participation were used. The accuracy of these data was checked by comparing across respondents. Evidence was gathered from the community organizations themselves, from the targets of their activities, and from knowledgeable but uninvolved informants, such as the education reporter of the local newspaper.

In answering the first broad question addressed by this study we found that the most direct and significant determinant of high impact is not the community context in which a group operates, or even its level of resources. Rather, it is a group's choice of tactics and activities that best explains its impact in a given community. One of the most important predictors of organizational success for NPOs and non-ESAA-funded groups alike was the decision to engage in advocacy activities. Such groups were the most likely to have a large impact because the changes they brought about usually affected

many people and were likely to be institutionalized. On the other hand, groups that delivered educational services could usually expect to have a low to moderate impact. Their inability to reach more than a small clientele and their tendency to effect only transitory changes precluded any large impact. Other factors contributing to a high group impact were the way a group responded to disagreements with school district policy, and its willingness and ability to coalesce with organizations pursuing similar goals.

Nonetheless, very few NPOs selected advocacy activities. Instead, the overwhelming majority of ESAA-NPOs in our sample (86 percent) delivered educational services. In contrast, only 25 percent of the non-ESAA-funded groups delivered these services. For NPOs this activity choice was completely independent of the desegregation phase of the school district; about as many NPOs delivered educational services in the early stages of desegregation as in the late. ESAA-funded groups tended to have moderate outcomes in contrast to non-ESAA-funded groups, whose outcomes tended to be either very small or very large. This finding reflects the lower risk, lower payoff activities NPOs tended to select. These predominantly educational activities tended to reduce the effects of minority isolation, but had less effect on facilitating desegregation. NPOs also tended to be more newly established, nonmembership groups with more material resources than other community groups. Our analysis indicates that ESAA-NPOs are by no means ineffective organizations: more than 75 percent had at least a moderate impact, 30 percent of the NPOs in our sample were able to bring about changes which facilitated desegregation, and 33 percent reduced the effects of minority isolation.

Yet the fact remains that even though 25 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups had no impact (as compared with 15 percent of ESAA-funded groups), 38 percent of them had a large impact. This figure compares with only 7 percent for ESAA-NPOs. *In other words, non-ESAA-funded groups as a whole had a much greater impact in their communities than did ESAA-NPOs.* In view of the increasing education focus of the NPO program, this result is not surprising.

In analyzing the determinants of group success, we focused on several variables which might be considered by federal officials in

establishing award criteria for the ESAA-NPO program. Included were factors such as:

1. The size of school district enrollment.
2. Openness of the school district to community input.
3. The number and percent of minority student enrollment.
4. Recency of the desegregation plan.
5. Size of the community group's resource base.
6. The group's choice of activities.

We assumed that the first four factors would be mediated through the group's resources and its choice of strategy, and would affect the group's impact only indirectly. However, we found that neither the district's size nor its racial composition, nor even its openness to community inputs, affected the resource-level or kinds of activities a group chose. The recency of a district's desegregation plan is important in that it positively predicts to a group's choice of advocacy-type activities which, in turn, are the activities most likely to result in the highest group impact. In other words, awarding ESAA-NPO grants on the basis of district size, racial composition, or openness to community input will not result in the funding of any more effective groups than are presently funded. Awarding grants to groups operating in districts in the early stages of desegregation will only result in the funding of more effective groups *if* these groups choose to engage in advocacy-type activities such as information dissemination, efforts to increase community input into school district decisionmaking, and attempts to influence site selection or school closings. Recency of plan implementation does not of itself increase a group's chances of achieving a high impact.

We also found that a community group's material resources had no significant effect on group impact.

Consequently, of the half-dozen policy variables we considered as possible award criteria for the ESAA-NPO program, only one--a group's decision to engage in advocacy-type activities--was a positive and significant determinant of high group impact.

Given these findings, and assuming that federal policymakers wish to continue the ESAA-NPO program, there are two options available to them. One is to continue the program in its present form, and the other is to reorient it so that ESAA-funded groups will direct more of their efforts toward facilitating desegregation.

Some very convincing arguments can be made for continuing the program in its present form. NPOs usually provide a needed service; they provide it efficiently; and the impact they have assists students who have been the victims of racial isolation.

Clearly, the evidence presented in Vols. I and II of this study indicates that over time the focus of the NPO program shifted away from activities that actually facilitated desegregation to ones that provided educational services to disadvantaged students. Because of the type of activities authorized by program regulations and because of the requirement for LEA review of funding applications, the vast majority of ESAA-NPOs are funded to deliver educational services rather than to engage in advocacy or desegregation activities. Consequently, it is not surprising that we found the overwhelming majority of ESAA-NPOs delivering educational services.

Still, the fact remains that the ESAA-NPO program was conceived to be more than a source of compensatory education funding for community groups, and in the view of many federal officials, this intent persists in spite of increased funding of compensatory projects. Its primary purpose was to fund community organizations who could assist school districts in facilitating desegregation. This purpose would seem to imply that the program ought to be reoriented and different types of activities encouraged. Given the history of the ESAA-NPO program and its predecessor, the Community Groups program, it is unlikely that federal policymakers would consider it politically feasible to fund community groups that are pressing desegregation suits against local school districts. But a number of other activities would seem acceptable for ESAA funding, including information dissemination, the building of support for the desegregation plan, efforts to increase parental involvement in the schools, and assistance to parents who want to make the schools more responsive to their needs. These

activities are more likely to have a desegregation-related impact, and are also the most likely to produce the largest overall impact.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A large-scale research effort relies on the talents and skills of many people. We were most fortunate in being able to draw on the expertise of an extraordinarily dedicated group of researchers. Renee Gould, Beverly Lowe, Susan Reese, Abby Robyn, Marta Samulon, Phyllis Wasserstrom, and Joanne Wuchitech found many groups to sample from in the course of a telephone survey; they also efficiently set up our complicated field trips. Field interviewers Tom Bikson, Joyce Brooks, Phyllis Cheng, Robert Crain, Stephen Crocker, Renee Gould, Jennifer Hawes, James Hyman, Janera Johnson, Jackie Kimbrough, Lee Laniear, Susan Reese, Marta Samulon, Gerald Sumner, Stephen Weatherford, and Joanne Wuchitech collected high-quality information on an often sensitive topic and wrote detailed and thoughtful case studies. Field interviewers and Jane Cobb coded case studies with care. Gerald Sumner developed and implemented an elaborate and effective sampling plan.

The analysis reported here has been improved by the comments and substantive expertise of Stephen Weatherford and Christopher Myers. Robert Yin and Stephen Carroll, who served as the technical reviewers for this report, offered especially useful suggestions concerning the presentation and interpretation of this material.

Members of the Project Advisory Committee, Jess Pat Elliott, Joanne Fountain, Winnifred Green, Ruby Martin, and Newman Walker, provided helpful comments and perspectives throughout the course of the project. Robert York, the U.S. Office of Education Project Officer for this study, has been supportive throughout the course of the research; his comments have substantially improved the study design and presentation of findings.

Constance Smedley and Ann Westine handled the often tedious jobs associated with a project of this magnitude skillfully and with good humor.

We are especially grateful for the hospitality of the communities around the country that hosted our fieldwork, and for the

candidness of school and community persons who shared their thoughts and feelings regarding community groups and school desegregation.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SUMMARY v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS xi

TABLES xv

Section

I. INTRODUCTION 1
Major Research Issues 3

II. STUDY DESIGN 9
Data and Methodology 9
Measurement of Community Group Impact 12

III. A DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF ESAA-FUNDED AND NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUPS 22
Composition of Sample 22
Comparison of ESAA-Funded and Non-ESAA-Funded Groups ... 24
Summary and Conclusions 44

IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXTUAL FACTORS IN EXPLAINING COMMUNITY GROUP RESOURCES AND CHOICE BEHAVIOR 46
Relevant Variables 48
Findings 50
Discussion 57

V. COMMUNITY GROUPS: RESOURCES AND STRATEGIES 60
Organizational Resources 63
Group Tactics and Choice of Activities 71
Summary 82

VI. CONCLUSIONS 84

Appendix

A. SAMPLE SELECTION AND FIELDWORK PROCEDURES 93

B. CASE SURVEY METHOD AND CODING INSTRUMENTS 104

C. DESCRIPTION OF CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES 111

TABLES

1. Distribution of Community Groups by Type 23
2. Subjective School District Financial Situation by ESAA Funding Status 26
3. Year of First or Most Recent Desegregation Plan by ESAA Funding Status 26
4. Percent Black Enrollment by ESAA Funding Status 27
5. Distribution of Community Groups by Type and Funding Status 28
6. Resources Received from LEAs by Community Groups 31
7. Activity Choices of Community Groups 34
8. Outcome Scores for Community Groups by Funding Source 40
9. Summary of Typical ESAA-Funded and Non-ESAA-Funded Group Characteristics 45
10. Variables and Indices Used in Analyses 49
11. Effect of Community Characteristics and Aspects of Local Desegregation Context on Level of Group Resources in Non-ESAA-Funded Groups 52
12. Effect of Community Characteristics and Aspects of Local Desegregation Context on Level of Group Resources in NPOs 53
13. Effect of Local Desegregation Context, Group Resources, and LEA Political and Organizational Characteristics on Non-ESAA-Funded Group Strategy and Activity Choices 55
14. Effect of Local Desegregation Context, Group Resources, and LEA Political and Organizational Characteristics on NPO Strategy and Activity Choices 56
15. Effect of Organizational Resource Factors on an ESAA-NPO's Choice of Tactics and Activities 61
16. Effect of Organizational Resource Factors on a Non-ESAA-Funded Group's Choice of Tactics and Activities 62
17. Effect of Organizational Resources and Strategy Factors on an ESAA-NPO's Impact 64
18. Effect of Organizational Resources and Strategy Factors on a Non-ESAA-Funded Group's Impact 65
19. Relationship Between Group's Activity Choice and Stage of Change Effected by Group 74

20. Relationship Between Activity Choice and Extent to Which Group Impact Is Related to Desegregation 75

A.1. Regional Distribution of School Districts and Community Groups 100

I. INTRODUCTION

The Emergency School Aid Act Nonprofit Organization program funds community-based organizations working to facilitate school desegregation or to reduce the effects of minority isolation. It is a part of the larger ESAA program which is designed to channel federal funds into school districts to aid the desegregation process or to reduce the effects of minority isolation.[1]

A desegregation plan is usually imposed by authorities outside the normal governance of the school district. Consequently, there are usually obstacles to its successful implementation. Often some members of the community actively oppose the plan. The board of education, normally responsible for the initiation of school policies, may be unwilling or unable to provide the necessary leadership. In some instances, the school district administration, which until the desegregation order had opposed such a move in court, must then implement the policy it opposed a few months earlier. Even without such obstacles, a school district that is implementing a desegregation plan has a greater need for resources than it would normally.

For these reasons, Congress enacted the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). The basic purposes of the Act are:

1. To meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students or faculty.
2. To encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in schools with substantial proportions of minority group children.
3. To aid school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation.

---

[1] Volume I in this series deals with the legislative origins and programmatic operations of the ESAA-NPO program.

Although the majority of the funds provided under this Act are allocated to public school districts, approximately 8 percent or $17.2 million is targeted to private, nonprofit organizations. Nonprofit organizations (NPOs) are community groups, funded on the assumption that certain activities are better performed by people and organizations outside the regular school district structure. Among the activities NPOs can perform are supplemental remedial services, educational enrichment programs, inter-ethnic social, cultural, and recreational programs, information dissemination and parental involvement programs, as well as programs to deal with suspensions and expulsions related to desegregation.

A number of studies have assessed the impact of community organizations on the operations of federal programs such as Model Cities and community development.[1] But very few have examined the role of community organizations in the implementation of state and federal judicial mandates. This study is designed to assess the impact of community organizations in the implementation of one major social policy --school desegregation. It addresses two policy-related questions:

- What are the most important factors in predicting the impact a community organization will have on facilitating school desegregation?
- How does the impact of groups funded under the ESAA-NPO program compare with that of non-ESAA-funded groups?

These questions were selected for study because the answers will provide policymakers with information that can be used in their efforts to fund the groups most likely to have a large impact. As with most federal programs, officials in Washington have limited control over how an ESAA-NPO group operates, once it receives funding. However, federal policymakers can shape the direction of the program by the

[1] See, for example, Charles Brecher, *The Impact of Federal Anti-Poverty Policies*, Praeger, New York, 1973, and Richard L. Cole, *Citizen Participation and the Urban Policy Process*, D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1974.

kind of groups they choose to fund. Funding award criteria directly affect not only what kinds of organizations receive funding but also which school districts have ESAA-NPO groups and the activities these groups select. Knowing what the important factors are for predicting community group impact may help federal officials in modifying present award criteria and in funding the groups most likely to have the greatest impact.

This section briefly discusses some of the major issues involved. Section II describes the methodology of the study, including our measurement of group impact. Section III presents an overview of our sample of community groups and compares ESAA-NPOs with non-ESAA-funded groups on a number of important dimensions. Sections IV and V outline our main findings, and Sec. VI discusses the policy implications of the study.

MAJOR RESEARCH ISSUES

Past research and our own exploratory fieldwork prior to beginning this study indicated that three significant types of factors may affect the impact of a community group working to facilitate school desegregation: community and school district characteristics, the local desegregation context, and the organizational characteristics of the group itself.

Community and school district characteristics comprise a broad spectrum of demographic, socioeconomic, and political factors. The following were included in our analysis:

- *Socioeconomic and political characteristics of the community*[1]
  - size and racial composition
  - its economic health
  - how elites view the vitality of the area
  - the economic status of the black community
  - the access of blacks to the political system and the political sophistication of black community organizations

[1] The measurement of these variables is described in the sections that follow.

- *School district demographics*
  - the size, racial composition, and wealth of the district
  - enrollment trends and the size of the nonpublic school population
- *School district political and organizational characteristics*
  - community and elite support for the public schools
  - the openness of the school district to community group inputs
  - level of consensus among school board members on desegregation
  - quality of superintendent leadership

In analyzing these variables, we made two assumptions; first, that school district and community factors have a direct effect on the organizational characteristics of a community group, particularly its choice of strategy and activities; and second, that these contextual factors have only an indirect effect on group outcomes. In other words, the effect of the district and community context on group impact is mediated through a group's own characteristics, such as its resource base and choice of activities.

Our first assumption was based on the belief that community organizations, much more than governmental bureaucracies or even political parties, are strongly shaped by their environment. The influence of interest groups is strongly determined by the structure and distribution of power within the governmental agencies the groups must deal with.[1] When these governmental bureaucracies are the targets of a community group's activity, the group's choice of strategy must necessarily be based on its perception of the target's receptivity to different forms of community group activity.[2] In addition, most community organizations have neither the resources nor the legitimacy

---

[1] James Q. Wilson, *Political Organizations*, Basic Books, New York, 1973, p. 337.

[2] Jeffrey M. Berry, *Lobbying for the People*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1977, p. 265.

of an official governmental agency. Unlike a governmental bureaucracy with its own permanent mission, many of the groups examined in this study frequently reshape their activity agenda in response to events and changing policies in the larger community.

In spite of this reliance on the larger environment for their strategy and activity choices, community group outcomes are not directly determined by community and school district characteristics. For example, if there is strong support for the public schools and the school district is open to community input, the climate of opinion will probably be more conducive to community group activity. But this situation does not of itself guarantee community group success. Included in our fieldwork sample were high and low impact groups; both of these types operated in school districts that were open and supportive of community group activity as well as in districts that were much more hostile to community organizations. The explanation for this similarity between the two very different kinds of districts is that environment is mediated through a group's choice of activities, the quality of its leadership, and the way it uses the environment to become visible in the community. In a sense, community and school district characteristics provide community groups with the basic material from which to shape their agenda, but whether they make good use of this material depends on a group's own characteristics.

The school district characteristic that federal policymakers have considered most important is the district's demographic composition. In evaluating proposals for NPO funding, one-half of the total points that reviewers can award are based on (1) the number and percent of minority group children enrolled in a school system and (2) the effective net reduction in minority group isolation as measured in terms of the number and percentage of children affected in target schools.[1]

---

[1]The present funding criteria include these statistical criteria for a maximum of 45 points. An additional 45 points can be awarded for a number of quality criteria, including needs assessment, project objectives, project design, staffing, service delivery, parental and community involvement, resource management, and project evaluation.

Volume I of this report presents a detailed analysis of the ESAA-NPO funding process.

These criteria assume that school districts with a large minority population have greater needs than other districts. The need of a particular school district, however, does not of itself assure effective NPO activity; this depends on how well groups adapt their strategies to the larger environment. Therefore, if federal policymakers are concerned with program effectiveness, they need to know whether the use of such demographic criteria results in the funding of organizations that are most likely to have the greatest impact.

Similar concerns need to be addressed when considering the effect of the local desegregation context on group impact. Included in this class of variables are the following:

- o *Local desegregation context*
  - the extensiveness of the desegregation plan
  - the stage of plan implementation
  - white acceptance of the inevitability of desegregation
  - the attitude of community elites toward desegregation
  - the strength of groups supporting desegregation as compared to those opposing it

Several questions can be asked about the role of the local desegregation context in predicting group impact, but the most important ones concern the recency of the desegregation plan. As the word "Emergency" in the title of the ESAA legislation indicates, the intent of Congress in authorizing this program was to provide additional assistance to school districts implementing a desegregation plan. The Carter administration has tried to put this intent into practice by proposing to Congress that the recency of a Local Education Agency's (LEA's) desegregation plan be used as an award criterion. In terms of the NPO program, then, proportionately more money would be allocated to groups working in districts in the early stages of plan implementation. This recommendation raises two related policy questions:

- Are those groups funded as NPOs likely to engage in the activities most needed in a currently desegregating district?
- Will the addition of such an award criterion result in the funding of more successful groups than those currently funded under the ESAA-NPO program?

As with community and school district characteristics, we assumed that the local desegregation context had an indirect effect on group impact. This effect is mediated through a group's own characteristics, particularly its choice of strategy and activities. However, we would expect a group to be sensitive to its environment and to select activities appropriate to a district's desegregation context. If this assumption is correct, we should find that groups that selected activities appropriate to the district's stage of desegregation had a greater impact than groups that selected inappropriate activities.

For example, school district officials and community groups involved in plan implementation have found that in the early stages, activities such as rumor control and information dissemination are needed.[1] Consequently, if our hypothesis is valid, groups that perform these activities in newly desegregating districts will have a greater impact than groups that perform activities more peripheral to plan implementation, such as tutoring.

Our final set of variables includes both the characteristics of the community group itself and the group's choice of strategies and activities:

- *Resources of the community group*
  - size of organizational budget and staff
  - major funding sources
  - group visibility
  - quality of organizational leadership

---

[1] Elinor Hart, *Desegregation Without Turmoil: The Role of the Multi-Racial Community Coalition in Preparing for Smooth Transition*, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Washington, D.C., 1977.

- o *Community group strategies and choice of activities*
  - willingness of group to form coalitions
  - tactics used by group in the event of disagreement with school district policies
  - whether the group's major activities are educational, political, or directly related to school desegregation

In examining these variables we wanted to know which factors were the most significant ones for predicting high group impact. Once we had determined this we could then begin to consider what alternative kinds of award criteria would result in the funding of ESAA-NPOs most likely to have the greatest impact. For example:

- o Is it better to fund groups that already have a sizeable material resource base or is it more effective to fund groups that have no or few material resources?
- o What kinds of activities are the most likely to result in a high group impact?

To answer these questions we designed a field-based study to collect relevant data on a sample of ESAA-funded NPOs as well as on a comparison sample of community groups not receiving ESAA funds. Section II describes our study design.

II. STUDY DESIGN

The design of this study has two unique features. First, both the quantitative and qualitative data on which the analysis is based were derived from open-ended field interviews and a subsequent, in-depth case study of each school district we visited. Second, unlike most studies of interest groups and community organizations, this one tried to assess the kind and amount of change the groups in our sample were actually able to bring about in their own communities. This section describes our data base, the methodology of the study, and the way we measured community group impact.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Our analysis is based on interview and record data collected on 131 community organizations located in forty school districts throughout the country.[1] All currently desegregating districts in the country were included in the sample,[2] and the remainder of districts receiving ESAA funds were stratified according to size and region, and then selected randomly.[3] These school districts range in size from eight with enrollments of more than 100,000 students to three with enrollments of less than 5000 students.[4]

---

[1] Sample selection and fieldwork procedures are detailed in Appendix A. Data were originally collected on 146 organizations, but 15 of these were eliminated from the final analysis because they were not presently engaged in any activities related to school desegregation.

[2] As of the spring of 1977, nine districts were either preparing to implement a plan or were in the early stages of plan implementation.

[3] Assurances of confidentiality were given to all respondents; names of school districts and of groups are not disclosed.

[4] A complete description of our school district and community group sample is included in Sec. III.

To maximize the range of groups studied in a given district, we gathered information by telephone from knowledgeable informants (e.g., education reporter of the local newspaper, chairwoman of the League of Women Voters' education committee, and the school community relations director of the LEA) about the community groups in that LEA and the centrality of each to the desegregation process.

We selected the sample of organizations by eliciting from these informants the names of all groups they knew or had heard of that did any work in the areas of school desegregation or minority isolation. Discussions with other social science researchers who were familiar with particular sites validated our search--in every case we found as many or more groups than they had. This universe of groups was scored on centrality to the district desegregation process, and groups were ranked in order of their centrality. This centrality indicator was a measure of where an organization stood in relation to the desegregation process: what the group did and how much interaction the group had with other groups working on desegregation problems. This measure was designed to ensure that we did not limit our sample to only the most visible groups in a community. Once groups had been stratified according to their centrality, they were selected randomly. If the sample did not include an ESAA-funded NPO in each school district, one NPO was randomly added to the list of groups to be interviewed. In districts with multiple NPOs an additional NPO was added as well.

Once our sample of school districts and community organizations was selected, a two-person team of interviewers spent approximately one week in each school district during the spring of 1977 interviewing knowledgeable informants, group leaders, and the targets of each group's activities. Depending on the size of the school district, between twenty and forty respondents were interviewed in each district.

Because of the large number of community groups and sites included in our sample, we were faced with the choice of either using closed-ended survey questionnaires in the field or finding a way to aggregate open-ended interviews systematically. We rejected the first option because it would have prevented interviewers from following new

leads while in the field, and it would have prematurely standardized information and made us less sensitive to the uniqueness of individual sites.

Consequently, we decided to pursue traditional case study methods while in the field and used an open-ended interview format. Field staff then wrote a case study on each site visited. These cases were based on a very detailed and comprehensive outline so as to maximize comparability across sites. Because of the tremendous amount of data on each case and the large number of cases, traditional case study analysis could not be used. Although to our knowledge it had never been used before on primary data, we decided the case survey method would be the best way to aggregate our case studies.

With the case survey method, which was originally designed as a means of performing secondary data analysis on existing case studies, a closed-ended form is used to obtain similar information from each of the selected cases. Intercoder reliability is established by having a subsample of cases coded by more than one reader. With this method, then, the qualitative and descriptive data found in case studies are translated into a form that can be used in quantitative analysis.[1]

Because we were working with data we had collected ourselves, we felt we would have much better quality control than studies using this method on secondary data. In addition, we would have fewer missing data problems, and the case studies would be written in such

---

[1]For a discussion of the case survey method, see William A. Lucas, *The Case Survey Method: Aggregating Case Experience*, The Rand Corporation, R-1515-RC, October 1974; Robert K. Yin and Karen A. Heald, "Using the Case Survey Method to Analyze Policy Studies," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 20, September 1975, pp. 371-381.

For applications of the method, see Robert K. Yin and Douglas Yates, *Street-Level Governments: Assessing Decentralization and Urban Services*, D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1975; Robert K. Yin et al., *A Review of Case Studies of Technological Innovations in State and Local Services*, The Rand Corporation, R-1870-NSF, February 1976. A similar method is used by William Gamson in *Strategy of Social Protest*, Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois, 1975.

a way as to facilitate the extraction of codable data. Therefore, a closed-ended survey form was used for each community group, and data were extracted on its characteristics and the characteristics of the school district and community in which it operated. The analysis in this study is based primarily on the quantitative data derived from the case survey forms, but throughout our research we have tried to be sensitive to unique conditions and events as reported in individual case studies. Our aim has been to integrate traditional case study analysis with the more quantitative case survey method.[1]

One of the most difficult problems we faced in designing this study was the question of how community group impact ought to be measured. The following subsection outlines the impact measure we constructed.

MEASUREMENT OF COMMUNITY GROUP IMPACT

To compare ESAA-funded NPOs with other community organizations involved in school desegregation we had to construct an impact score that could measure the amount of change each group had brought about in its own community. On one level, we could simply have asked whether or not a group had accomplished its stated purpose. The answer to this question would have told federal policymakers and administrators whether or not NPOs actually did what they had proposed in their applications for funding. Although this is an important question, there are also other, equally significant questions that need consideration, including:

- Whether or not a community group's activity actually affected the desegregation process in a given city--e.g., Was the substance and/or timing of the desegregation plan affected?
- The extent to which a group's activity caused changes in school district policies, programs, and procedures.

[1] A description of the case survey instrument and a discussion of our reliability analysis is included in Appendix B.

For purposes of this study, then, it was important to know whether or not community groups were able to bring about changes that extended beyond the individual students, teachers, and parents with whom the groups may have come into direct contact.

Unfortunately, in the area of group impact, past research was of limited use. Most past studies of interest groups and community organizations have sidestepped the issue of measuring the actual impact of a group and have instead examined the internal effectiveness of organizations. For example, in his study of local units of the League of Women Voters, Likert defined organizational effectiveness subjectively, based on respondents' perceptions of the size, rate of growth, and fund-raising ability of local associations.[1] In other words, these were measures of organizational maintenance, rather than direct measures of a group's external impact on the community. It was because of this lack of guidance from past research that we devised the scoring system described below.

In measuring the impact of a community organization, we were attempting to determine the type and scope of changes which had occurred as a result of a group's activity. The field staff was instructed to collect data on a maximum of two activities for each of the groups studied. For cases where there was more than one change per activity, the score was averaged across all the changes. Similarly, the final impact score was also averaged across the two activities.[2]

Before describing the components of our final impact score, we think it is important to note the kind of evidence we obtained. Although the usual quantitative measures of output such as achievement test data were generally unavailable or inappropriate, highly visible indicators such as the establishment of new programs or an increase in parental participation were used.

---

[1] Rensis Likert, *New Patterns of Management*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961, Chap. 10, as discussed in Wilson, op. cit., p. 251.

[2] Fifty-eight percent of the groups in our sample performed more than one desegregation-related activity.

The reliability and validity of these data were checked by triangulating among respondents. Not only was evidence gathered from the community organizations themselves, but also from the targets of their activities. For example, if a group tutored students, the field staff interviewed parents, teachers, and principals to find out whether student achievement or motivation had changed. If a group had lobbied for changes in school district policies, LEA administrators and school board members were asked about the group and the extent to which its activities had actually influenced district decisionmaking. The same kind of validation process was used for groups that attempted to influence a desegregation plan. For example, in checking on one community group instrumental in writing a district's desegregation plan, we interviewed the plaintiffs' attorney and the presiding judge in the case.

In addition to speaking with the targets of organizational activity, field staff also interviewed knowledgeable informants, such as the education reporter of the local newspaper. Although not directly involved with the activities of the groups, these people were familiar with them and could provide an assessment of each group's impact and a comparison across all groups working in a given community.

In addition to type and scope of change, our impact measure contains a specific desegregation component. Each of the three components is listed below and then described separately in greater detail:

- o The type and scope of change a group brought about.
- o The stage of implementation of the change.
- o Whether or not the change facilitated desegregation or reduced the effects of minority isolation.

Type and Scope of Change

After extensive fieldwork and a review of relevant literature, we enumerated twelve kinds of changes which could be effected by groups like those in the sample. They were assigned scores between 1 and 6, with individual-level changes receiving the fewest points and institutional-level or policy changes receiving the most points.

These changes differ in *scope* (roughly, the number of people affected) and in *type* (for instance, some changes impact on individual students, others on district decisionmaking). Consequently, each change brought about by a group was classified into one of twelve categories on the basis of the scope and type of change it caused. While these categories are distinct, experience with the coding procedure indicated that variation existed within each category. Therefore, each category includes a range of scores, rather than a unique score. However, coders were instructed to assign a unique score to each change selected from the range of scores appropriate for the category. This decision was based on the queries listed below:

	Scope Value
1. *Change in attitudes of individuals* - How many people affected? How important are the people? How central are the attitudes?	1-3
2. *Change in achievement or motivation of individuals* - How many people affected? How important are the people? How central is the motivation?	1-3
3. *Change in school-based programs or level of resources available* - How many schools/students affected? How important is the program?	3-5
4. *Change in level of parent and/or community involvement with the schools* - How many people? What issues or level of involvement? Who are the people? For example, score higher if a usually uninvolved group or a potentially influential one is newly involved.	4-6

	Scope Value
5. *Change in the substance or timing of the desegregation plan* - Generally score lower for changes in timing, higher for changes in substance.	5-7
6. *Change in level of information of community members* - How many people affected? How valuable and central is the information? Did this information promote participation, lobbying, or other activity?	4-6
7. *Change in LEA budget allocations or budgeting process* - What items affected? How central is the change to equal educational opportunity?	5-6
8. *Change in LEA staffing patterns or personnel decisions* - How many people affected and which positions?	5-6
9. *Reduced white flight* - How much reduction? How many and which schools? Score higher if school is at tipping point or if decreased flight has a systemwide impact.	4-6
10. *Change in level of demand for community group's services* - What services? Does this change help the group or its clients?	3-5
11. *Change in LEA rules or procedures (e.g., suspensions)* - Which rules? How closely related are they to equalizing treatment among students?	3-6
12. *Change in level of responsiveness of schools to community needs and demands* - How many schools? On what issues? To which segments of the community? Score higher if a usually ignored segment.	4-6

Because scoring on the type and scope of a change was a rather complicated procedure, an illustration is in order. If, for example, a group engaged in tutoring was able to show that because of its efforts students with poor school attendance records were now more likely to attend classes, this change would be scored in Category 2, *Change in the achievement or motivation of individuals*. If only a few students were affected (relative to the total clientele of the group), then a score of 1 or 2 would be assigned. If, however, a large proportion of the group's clientele exhibited such a change, then the group would receive a score of 3.

Stage of Implementation of Change

Given the difficulty of moving from intentions to implementation, each change was scored according to its stage of actual implementation. The four stage scores are as follows:

	Stage Value
1. *Fully implemented change* - This is a change that has been institutionalized or that is assumed to be relatively permanent (in something other than attitudes or achievement).	4
2. *Relatively permanent change in achievement or attitudes* - This is a change whose effect on individuals has lasted for a year or more.	3
3. *In process or transitory change* - "In process" changes have not been permanently institutionalized, though they may be planned or in the process of implementation. Attitude change that has endured less than a year or that may be transitory would be coded as "in process."	2

	Stage Value
4. *Community and/or decisionmakers aware of issue*	1
- This includes changes that have not yet had a systemic impact or that may never have such an impact. For example, a problem is now on the school board agenda or the issue has been highlighted for the first time in a newspaper editorial.	

Once the stage score is included, changes of the same type and scope can differ in their value. For example, a community group might present evidence to the school board that black students are suspended more frequently without a hearing than are white students. Such an activity would be scored on type and scope under Category 11, *Change in LEA rules or procedures*. However, in one case it might only receive one point on the stage score because the evidence the group presented has only warranted public discussion at the school or district level. While school officials acknowledge the problem exists, they have not yet really done anything about it. In another instance, a group might present the same evidence and officials in some district schools will begin to hold hearings before suspending a student, but such a practice is not yet required as district policy. This group would receive 2 points for an "in process" change. If, on the other hand, the evidence presented by the group results in a district policy requiring all principals to hold a hearing before suspending a student, then the group would receive 4 points for an institutionalized change.

Although this component of the total score allowed us to be sensitive to the stage of implementation of a given change, we were constrained in this effort by the cross-sectional nature of our data. While we collected background information on each group's past track record, it was necessary to confine our impact score to recent group achievements so as to make the scores comparable across all groups.

Hence, our impact score must be thought of as time-specific and therefore not reflecting the entire history of a group's achievements.

Relationship of Change to Desegregation

Because this study assesses the effect of community groups on school desegregation, the third component of our impact score measures this relationship. Changes were scored as follows:

	Value
o *Facilitated the desegregation process*	2
o *Reduced the effects of minority isolation*	1
o *Had no effect on either desegregation or minority isolation*	0

In making this determination, coders considered such factors as whether or not the changes brought about by a group made implementation of a desegregation plan more efficient or smoother (e.g., by building community support for the plan). Or, in cases where a group's activities were unrelated to desegregation, it was necessary to determine whether or not the changes brought about by the group reduced the effects of minority isolation. For example, a tutoring activity might only recruit minority students as clients and therefore have nothing to do with desegregation. However, this activity could contribute to more equal educational achievement and thus reduce the effects of minority isolation.[1]

[1]This latter category, reducing the effects of minority isolation, is considered by many to be demeaning because it assumes a deficit model for minority group academic achievement. In any event it is only peripherally related to the whole issue of school desegregation. However, this category has been included because reducing the effects of minority isolation is one of the purposes of the ESAA program and therefore must be included in this evaluation.

In fact, one might argue that a more valid scoring procedure would have been to make the score for a change that facilitated desegregation much greater than for a change that reduced the effects of minority isolation (e.g., assign the former a score of 4 and the latter a score of 1). However, because we were evaluating a program that had the reduction of minority isolation as one of its objectives, we minimized the difference between scores on the two types of changes.

Using these three components, the changes brought about by a group's activities were scored on a 0-13 point scale.[1] At the same time, the components of the total impact score can also be analyzed separately. Thus, for example, we can examine the reasons why some activities have a direct impact on the desegregation process while others do not.

Two obvious criticisms can be made about this impact score: first, that it is subjective and based on coder and interviewer judgments; and second, that the scoring system is skewed in favor of macro-level changes and ones that have been institutionalized. While each of these criticisms may have some validity, we feel that any type of impact score would be subject to similar criticisms. Although we feel that this method of scoring is the best way to assess community group impact, we do want to make our assumptions explicit.

We were sensitive to both of the above criticisms while developing the scoring system. To minimize coder and interviewer judgments, the research staff was instructed to adhere to strict rules of evidence. For example, conclusions about a group's impact had to be corroborated by respondents in several different role positions. In addition, the authors read each case study and checked to make certain that a group's impact score was appropriate, given the evidence presented in the case.

In dealing with the second criticism, we can make explicit the assumptions we used in deciding which changes were, in effect, better than others. The following are among the most important:

- o A community organization has a greater impact if it is able to bring about a change that extends beyond the people with whom the group has direct contact.

---

[1] The maximum score a group could receive was 13: 7 for the type and scope of change, 4 for the stage of implementation of a change, and 2 for its relationship to desegregation. However, no group in our sample scored higher than 12.

- o A community organization has a greater impact if it is able to influence a governmental agency to deliver a needed service to clients than if the group itself has to deliver the service.
- o A community organization has a greater impact if it is able to cause institutional change (in this case, school district policies and procedures) rather than individual-level change.

We feel that these assumptions are justified, given what we know about school district behavior and policy implementation. The groups in our sample have limited resources as compared with governmental agencies. Therefore, these groups can be most effective if they serve as a catalyst for school and civic agencies with the capacity to deliver services on a broader and more permanent basis.

Once we had constructed the impact score, we could begin to address the policy questions outlined in Sec. I. Our primary means of testing these relationships was multiple regression analysis, a statistical technique that allowed us to sort out the net effect of each of the independent variables on our dependent variable, group impact.

Before the main findings are given in detail, an overview of our sample is presented in Sec. III. In addition, the characteristics of ESAA-funded NPOs and groups not receiving ESAA funds are compared.

III. A DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF ESAA-FUNDED AND NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUPS

This section describes the sample of community groups, both ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded, on which this report is based. It then presents a comparison of ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups across a range of variables important to understanding and predicting group behavior and outcomes. These variables, which include both contextual and group level factors, will be important in the analyses to be presented in subsequent sections of this report and will ultimately enable us to address the policy questions that motivate the study.

COMPOSITION OF SAMPLE

The 131 community organizations included in this study represent a broad spectrum of groups ranging from elite business and civic groups and civil rights organizations, to small neighborhood-based groups (Table 1 details the types of groups in the sample). Ten of the groups have no organizational funds; five have budgets of over $1 million. However, most groups have budgets between $10,000 and $100,000. Fifty-nine (45 percent) of the study groups received ESAA-NPO funds during project year 1976-77. Approximately 38 percent of the groups receive the majority of their organizational funds from private sources such as membership dues, donations, and fund-raising activities. The remainder of the groups receive their funds from other federal, state, and local governmental sources. Thirty percent of all the groups have no paid staff; most of the organizations with paid staff employ fifteen people or less.

About 42 percent of the groups are membership organizations, and the rest are predominantly service delivery organizations with clients rather than members. The age of the organizations ranges from the three that are over seventy-five years old to the twenty-two that are two years old or younger. Approximately 31 percent of the groups are twenty years or older with an additional 41 percent in existence between five and twenty years.

Table 1

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY GROUPS BY TYPE

Group Type	Percent	Number
Neighborhood-based group	17	22
City-wide organization with no national affiliation	24	32
Court-appointed group	2	3
Elite business or civil group	6	8
Umbrella organization	7	9
League of Women Voters	8	10
Urban League	9	12
NAACP	6	8
Other[a]	21	27
	100	131

[a]Includes locally based service delivery groups and several nationally affiliated organizations such as the Urban Coalition and the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The types of groups included in this study are quite diverse, not only in terms of their size and resources but also in the kinds of activities they undertake. Approximately half of the groups (53 percent) deliver some type of educational services, including:

- o General educational enrichment such as tutoring.
- o Assistance to gifted students.
- o Development of new curriculum materials.
- o Provision of career information.
- o Counseling on suspensions or expulsions.
- o Provision of extracurricular activities.
- o Attempts to further intercultural understanding.

The activities engaged in by the remaining organizations (47 percent of the sample) are those most often associated with organized citizen action related to governmental institutions, for example:

- o Dissemination of information about school operations and policy.
- o Attempts to increase community inputs into school decisionmaking.
- o Lobbying to influence site selection or school closings.
- o Attempts to affect the content or timing of a school district's desegregation plan.
- o Filing of a suit against the district.

In essence, then, the groups in our sample perform three basic types of activities. They may do all or any of the following:

1. Provide educational services similar to those a school district might provide.
2. Work to improve school-community relations with such activities as information dissemination and by increasing parental participation in the schools.
3. Act in an adversary role with the school district by lobbying, protesting, and in some cases, filing suit against the district.

The next subsection discusses differences between ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups on these and other dimensions.

COMPARISON OF ESAA-FUNDED AND NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUPS

Groups that choose to apply for ESAA funds and are successful in obtaining them differ from non-ESAA-funded groups in important ways. These differences are manifest in all aspects of these organizations, from the number of years the group has been established, to leadership competence, volunteer support, and level of resources. Most significantly, they differ in choice of activities, group strategy, and level of group impact. Choice of activities and level of group outcomes most clearly distinguished NPOs from other groups. ESAA-funded groups in our sample overwhelmingly engaged in the delivery

of educational services. Their outcomes tended to be only moderately successful as compared with non-ESAA-funded groups. This subsection discusses these differences in some detail. Subsequent sections analyze the reasons for NPO choice of educational activities and their impact.

Contextual Factors

While community, school district, and desegregation context may be important factors in understanding community group behavior, because of the nature of our sampling scheme, we assumed there would be no a priori differences between ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups on these dimensions. Nearly all of the 40 districts we surveyed had one or more NPOs and one or more non-ESAA-funded community groups, and we assumed contextual factors would be shared approximately equally by ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups.

As shown in Tables 2, 3, and 4, only one of the three important background characteristics--year of most recent plan--varied significantly as a function of ESAA funding status.[1] This significant difference is due to the tendency for NPO funds to be directed to smaller southern districts, which generally have older plans. District financial status and percent black enrollment were distributed randomly across ESAA-funded groups.[2]

---

[1]Unless otherwise indicated, reported differences in percentage between groups are significant ($p<.05$) using a test of the significance of the difference between two sample proportions (Q. McNemar, *Psychological Statistics*, Wiley, New York, 1955, pp. 60-69).

[2]Perceived financial status of the school district is a single variable:

1 = Good to excellent
2 = Good considering trends
3 = Fair or poor
4 = Abysmal

Year first stage of plan or first year of most recent pupil reassignment plan is a single variable:

1 = 1976-1977
2 = 1972-1975
3 = 1963-1971

Percentage black enrollment is a single variable:

1 = Less than 25 percent
2 = 25-49 percent
3 = 50 percent or more

Table 2

SUBJECTIVE SCHOOL DISTRICT FINANCIAL SITUATION BY ESAA FUNDING STATUS[a]

Group	Good to Excellent	Good Considering Recent Trends	Fair or Poor	Abysmal
ESAA-funded (N=59)	27.1%	23.7%	37.3%	11.9%
Non-ESAA-funded (N=71)	36.6%	25.4%	31.0%	7.0%

[a]Cell entry is percentage of groups in each funding category located in school districts with subjective financial status listed.

Table 3

YEAR OF FIRST OR MOST RECENT DESEGREGATION PLAN BY ESAA FUNDING STATUS[a]

Group	1976-77	1972-75	1963-71
ESAA-funded (N=59)	18.5%[b]	38.9%	42.6%
Non-ESAA-funded (N=71)	32.1%	37.5%	30.3%

[a]Cell entry is percentage of groups in each funding category located in school districts with desegregation plans that began in the period specified.

[b]Column difference significant, $p < .05$.

Table 4

PERCENT BLACK ENROLLMENT BY ESAA FUNDING STATUS[a]

Group	Less Than 25%	25-59%	50% or More
ESAA-funded (N=59)	25.4%	52.5%	22.0%
Non-ESAA-funded (N=71)	30.9%	45.1%	23.9%

[a]Cell entry is percentage of groups in each funding category located in school districts with percent block enrollment specified.

Organizational Characteristics

Group Age. NPOs tend to be more recently established than the non-ESAA-funded groups in our sample.[1] Seventy-five percent of ESAA-funded groups were sixteen years old or less. In contrast, more than 44 percent of the non-ESAA-funded groups had been established more than sixteen years earlier. One reason for the difference in longevity between ESAA and non-ESAA-funded groups is the kind of groups that ESAA funds. As shown in Table 5, ESAA-funded groups tend to come disproportionately from the ranks of service delivery groups. However, the oldest civic groups in most communities are the League of Women Voters, the NAACP, the PTA chapter, and the elite business and civic groups.

Group Type. The typical NPO is not a membership group.[2] Only 30 percent of NPOs had members, as compared to 75 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups. Instead, NPOs tend to be organized and seen by their

[1]Year group first established is a single variable:
1 = 1972-1977
2 = 1962-1971
3 = 1872-1961

[2]Group membership status is a single variable:
0 = No members
1 = Has members

Table 5

DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNITY GROUPS
BY TYPE AND FUNDING STATUS
(N=131)

Group Type	Number Funded Under ESAA-NPO Program (N=59)	Number Not Funded by ESAA-NPO Program (N=72)
League of Women Voters (N=10)	0	10
Urban League (N=12)	10	2
NAACP (N=8)	0	8
Urban Coalition (N=1)	1	0
PTA (N=5)	2	3
Court-appointed group (N=3)	0	3
Umbrella organization (N=9)	3	6
Elite business or civic group (N=8)	1	7
Neighborhood-based group (N=22)	10	12
Citywide group with no national affiliation (N=32)	16	16
Other[a] (N=21)	16	5

[a]Includes locally based service delivery groups and several nationally affiliated organizations such as the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

communities as service organizations with minimal clientele participation. Because of ESAA funds, all NPOs had at least one paid staff member--a director.[1] Nearly all had other paid staff as well. Eighty-eight percent of NPOs had more than two paid staff members, although not all staff were necessarily supported with ESAA funds. In sharp contrast, 55 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups had no paid staff, and fully 69 percent had two or fewer paid staff members.

[1]Number of paid staff is a single variable:
0 = No paid staff
1 = 1-2 staff
2 = 3-6 staff
3 = 7-15 staff
4 = 17-240 staff

Social Class of Leader, Staff and Clients. In both ESAA and non-ESAA-funded groups, leader and staff (paid and unpaid) are overwhelmingly middle class: in non-ESAA-funded groups, the figure is 81 percent; in NPOs, 88 percent.[1] However, NPOs and non-ESAA-funded groups differ in the social class of their respective clientele and/or members.[2] NPOs are much more likely to have a lower socioeconomic status clientele than non-ESAA-funded groups, perhaps because NPOs tend to have paid staff and no members, while non-ESAA-funded groups are likely to be voluntary membership groups.

Non-ESAA-funded groups are therefore also more likely than NPOs to have leaders and staff who share social class status with their clientele or membership. In contrast, middle class NPO staff generally serve a lower socioeconomic status clientele. They are often former teachers, who tutor lower class children.

In sum, the modal non-ESAA-funded group looks much like a League of Women Voters chapter we visited in a small Eastern town. Established in the early 1950s, it boasts a large middle class, predominantly female membership. The president serves a one-year term without pay. At the time of our visit, it was engaged in disseminating a report it had researched and prepared on the implications of the latest desegregation plan produced by the school board.

In contrast, the modal NPO is relatively new in town, and has a paid staff which serves a lower class clientele. Typical is an NPO in a large city which was founded in the late 1960s to provide needed social services to a minority population in its own neighborhood. It received ESAA funds to run a tutoring program designed to raise the academic achievement of elementary school students in reading and

---

[1] Leader and staff socioeconomic status is a single variable:
1 = Lower and/or working class
2 = Middle and/or upper middle class
3 = People of all classes

[2] Member and client socioeconomic status is a single variable:
1 = Lower and/or working class
2 = Middle and/or upper middle class
3 = People of all classes

mathematics. About 100 neighborhood students, nearly all of whom are black or Hispanic, are tutored each semester. Staff members are trained reading specialists.

Group Resources

NPOs are much more affluent than non-ESAA-funded groups. Thanks to their ESAA funds, NPOs are never without resources, in contrast to 14 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups. Fifty-one percent of all groups in our sample had a yearly budget of $10,000 or less; 98 percent of NPOs had budgets *over* $10,000 a year.[1]

NPOs use at least some of their income to hire staff. Sixty-three percent of NPOs had seven or more full time staff members. In contrast, the typical non-ESAA-funded group had no paid staff. Of those with any paid staff, 53 percent had six or fewer staff members.

In addition to having more money and staff, NPOs were more likely than other community groups to ask for and receive resources from their LEA, as shown in Table 6.[2] NPOs that tutored were especially likely to receive LEA help. Often NPO tutoring was done in LEA classrooms left empty by declining enrollment; NPO tutors sometimes used classrooms in the evening. Principals frequently donated old books to the NPO or allowed the group access to the school library after regular hours. Information was the only LEA resource that non-ESAA-funded groups were as likely as NPOs to get. The reason for this was that information was necessary to many group activities--from tutoring to militant advocacy. Half of all non-ESAA-funded groups asked nothing of the LEA. Less than 10 percent of ESAA-funded groups made no requests.

---

[1]Group's annual budget is a single variable:
1 = No funds
2 = Below $1000
3 = $1001-10,000
4 = $10,001-100,000
5 = $100,001-1,000,000

[2]Resources provided by the LEA is an additive variable:

1 = Ideas for activities	1 = Publicity
1 = Space or equipment	1 = Information
1 = Staff time	-1 = Nothing, though assistance was requested
1 = Student referrals	0 = Nothing, and no assistance requested

Table 6

RESOURCES RECEIVED FROM LEAs
BY COMMUNITY GROUPS[a]

Group	Ideas	Space/ Equip-ment	LEA Staff Time	Student Referrals	Informa-tion[b]	Nothing, Though Help Requested	Nothing, and No Help Asked
ESAA-funded (N=59)	20.3 (N=12)	59.3 (N=25)	27.1 (N=16)	33.9 (N=20)	23.7 (N=14)	1.7 (N=1)	8.5 (N=5)
Non-ESAA-funded (N=71)	5.6 (N=4)	16.9 (N=12)	9.9 (N=7)	1.4 (N=1)	25.4 (N=18)	9.9 (N=7)	50.7 (N=36)

[a]Cell entry is percentage of groups in each funding category that received a given resource from the LEA. Row Ns may be greater than funding category N because some groups received several resources.

[b]Difference between groups not significant.

Non-ESAA-funded groups were less well off than NPOs, but they had other organizational resources NPOs tended to lack. These nonmaterial resources in many cases enabled groups with limited funds to have a substantial impact in their own community. For example, non-ESAA-funded groups were more likely to have volunteers to help pursue organizational activities or goals.[1] The reasons seem clear. Since 55 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups had no paid staff, they needed active volunteers. In contrast, paid staff in NPOs saw to organizational maintenance and the pursuit of activities and goals. While some NPOs did have many volunteers, respondents typically reported that the fact of paid staff and the lack of NPO efforts to recruit volunteers discouraged volunteerism. The greater number of volunteers

[1]A volunteer was defined as a person who spends considerable time working for the group. Membership status does not automatically imply volunteer status.

in non-ESAA-funded groups, combined with their smaller budgets, no doubt contributed to respondent feelings that on the whole, non-ESAA-funded groups were more efficient than NPOs.

Non-ESAA-funded groups were also slightly more likely than NPOs to have leaders judged to be highly competent, although the difference was not significant.[1] The leaders of these groups were also slightly more likely to have influence in the community independent of their group leader role.[2] Consistent with these findings, non-ESAA-funded groups were as well known in their own communities and were more likely to receive press coverage, both in local papers and in large metropolitan dailies.[3]

A non-ESAA-funded group which used its nonmaterial resources to good advantage was located in a large southern city. This group had no funds or paid staff and no prior experience with desegregation, but was able to organize and train its more than 500 parent-members to monitor implementation of the district's desegregation plan in the schools. The fact that observers were parents and participated as volunteers contributed to the group's high credibility. The community felt that the group had a real concern for students and was not trying to exploit the situation for its own advantage. The group was able to bring a number of problems to the public's awareness and successfully persuaded a resistant district to make a number of changes in the allocation of funds and the operation of programs, such as Title I.

---

[1] Leader competence is a single variable:
1 = Highly competent
2 = Adequate
3 = Inadequate

[2] Leader influence is a single variable:
0 = Little or no influence
1 = Substantial influence

[3] Group visibility is a single variable:
1 = Not well known
2 = Known to a small stratum or in own community
3 = Known citywide

Press coverage is a single variable:
1 = Almost never written up
2 = Receives occasional local coverage
3 = Receives frequent local coverage

These findings indicate that in general NPOs have a great deal more material resources than do non-ESAA-funded groups. However, non-ESAA-funded groups possess more nonmaterial, organizational resources. Level and nature of organizational resources are important predictors of group choice of activities and strategies, as Sec. IV will describe. Not surprisingly, the different patterns of group resources found in NPOs and non-ESAA-funded groups predict very different activities and approaches.

Activity Choice

Type of Activities. The overwhelming majority of ESAA-funded groups in our sample (86 percent) engaged in educational service activities, including provision of extracurricular activities, provision of career information, and most often, tutoring.[1] In stark contrast, only a quarter of non-ESAA-funded groups engaged in such activities.[2] As shown in Table 7, non-ESAA-funded groups chose advocacy activities such as information dissemination, or attempts to get more local control of schools, or they chose activities that were directly related to desegregation such as attempts to influence the content or timing of a desegregation plan, or attempts to reduce

---

[1]These choices are consistent with the thrust of program regulations. While community activities, including public information and parental involvement efforts, are one of the authorized activities, the overwhelming majority of authorized activities are oriented toward the direct provision of educational services to children (Program Regulations, Section 185.62 Authorized Activities). However, since some groups engaged in more than one type of activity, the percentage figures include groups that have done other activities as well as the one at issue.

[2]Whether a group delivers educational services is a single variable:

0 = Group does not deliver educational services

1 = Group delivers educational services (including assistance to gifted students, provision of career information, development of new curriculum materials, counseling on suspensions or expulsions, furthering cultural understanding, general educational enrichment, provision of extracurricular activities, provision of minority-relevant courses)

Table 7

ACTIVITY CHOICES OF COMMUNITY GROUPS[a]

Group	Education Services	Advocacy-Type Activities	Desegregation-Specific Activities
ESAA-funded (N=59)	86.4 (N=51)	30.5 (N=18)	3.4 (N=2)
Non-ESAA-funded (N=72)	25.4 (N=18)	67.6 (N=48)	45.1 (N=32)

[a]Cell entry is percentage of groups in funding category engaged in activities subsumed under activity label. N's sum to more than the number of groups, since some groups engaged in more than one activity. For the same reason, percentages sum to more than 100 percent.

white flight.[1] Forty-five percent of non-ESAA-funded groups engaged in desegregation-specific activities, as compared to only 3 percent of NPOs.[2]

---

[1]Whether a group engages in advocacy-type activities is a single variable:

0 = Group does not engage in advocacy-type activities

1 = Group engages in advocacy-type activities (including dissemination of information, improvement of school-community relations, attempts to get more local control of schools, attempts to increase community inputs into school decisionmaking, attempts to have minority staff hired or promoted, attempts to influence school site selection or school closings)

[2]Whether a group engages in desegregation-specific activities is a single variable:

0 = Group does not engage in desegregation-specific activity.

1 = Group engages in desegregation-specific activity (including filing suit against the district, attempts to influence content or timing of desegregation plan, attempts to reduce white flight)

Field respondents noted this tendency among NPOs to engage in activities other than those directly related to desegregation. They saw NPOs as less likely than other groups in their communities to be addressing desegregation or minority isolation problems.

In a number of districts in the preimplementation or early implementation stages of desegregation, the ESAA-funded group was running a tutoring program while other non-ESAA-funded groups formed umbrella organizations, set up rumor control hotlines, or tried to influence the content or timing of the plan. Typically, the NPO in a currently desegregating district did not engage in plan-related activities because such activities were not consistent with organizational history or objectives. For example, one NPO in a currently desegregating district provided drama experiences for children from different racial backgrounds. The sponsoring group was a theater--the ESAA-funded activity was an outgrowth of its normal nondesegregation-related activities. In another currently desegregating district, non-ESAA-funded groups were forming an umbrella organization and planned to lobby for changes in the plan. The NPO, run by an educator, was not involved. The NPO director felt that such activities were outside the group's educational goals.

The predominantly educational activities provided by NPOs are limited in their scope and in the number of persons to whom services are delivered. Seventy-two percent of all NPOs had target groups between 15 and 500. In contrast, non-ESAA-funded groups tended to focus their activities on a few decisionmakers (41 percent) or on a very large group (31 percent), such as "the community as a whole" in information dissemination efforts.[1]

---

[1]Size of client or target population is a single variable:
1 = A few decisionmakers
2 = Less than 100 persons
3 = 101-500 persons
4 = 501-1000 persons
5 = More than 1000 persons

NPO activities are more likely to have clients who are predominantly of one race than are the activities of non-ESAA-funded groups.[1] Usually, the clients are black children who use NPO tutorial services.

Effects of Context on Activity Choice. Since the groups in our sample were engaged in desegregation or minority isolation-related activity, we assumed that these groups would be sensitive to contextual factors, such as the district desegregation stage, in selecting group activities. In general, we found that LEA and city context were unrelated to NPO activity choices. So many of the NPOs were engaged in educational service activities that variations in activity choice as a function of LEA and city context were trivial. In contrast, non-ESAA-funded groups were responsive to some aspects of district context in making activity choices.

LEA desegregation context was not a good predictor of NPO activity choice. NPOs tended to deliver educational services regardless of LEA desegregation phase. In districts in the first two years of desegregation, 80 percent of NPOs were performing educational activities not directly related to the implementation of a desegregation plan. In districts that had had a plan for two to five years, 95 percent of NPOs were engaged in educational activities; in districts with plans more than six years old, this figure dropped to 83 percent. It is in these "older" districts, where desegregation was less likely to be an issue, that one would expect to find the largest concentration of educational activities.

Among non-ESAA-funded groups, however, activity choice was strongly influenced by LEA desegregation stage. Eighty-one percent of all non-ESAA-funded groups that engaged in desegregation-related activities were in districts with plans five years old or less.

Other features of the district desegregation plan (e.g., percent of students reassigned under mandatory aspects of the plan) were

---

[1] Clients predominantly of one race (>75 percent) is a single variable:

0 = No
1 = Yes

unrelated to group selection of educational activities.[1] Our data also indicate that percent minority enrollment was not a factor in NPO activity choices--NPOs are as likely to select educational activities in LEAs where more than half of the students are black as they are in districts with a minority of black students.[2]

A number of NPOs we visited reported that the idea for their activity had come from the LEA, usually because declining enrollment and resultant cutbacks in funds had forced the LEA to discontinue that particular activity. In one district, for example, the NPO had included field trips in its services when the LEA was forced to eliminate them. In the next year, a statewide tax redistribution was expected which would enable the LEA to once again fund field trips. The NPO had, as a result, cut field trips from next year's list of proposed activities.

Despite such exceptions, LEA financial status was unrelated to NPO choice of educational activities for the sample as a whole. NPOs were as likely to engage in educational activities in well-off districts as they were in districts that were cutting back services because of financial problems.

Group Strategies

A group's strategy is the way it chooses to use its resources in order to further group goals. Choice of strategy or tactics may depend on a number of factors, including organizational experience, activity choices, and the real or perceived constraints inherent in the funds the group receives.

---

[1] Percent students reassigned under mandatory aspects of the desegregation plan is a single continuous variable.

[2] Percent black enrollment is a single variable:
1 = Less than 25 percent
2 = 25-49 percent
3 = 50 percent or more

NPOs are less likely than other groups in our sample to engage in organized citizen action outside the group as a means of facilitating group goals.[1] NPOs were less likely to protect district policies or to form coalitions with other groups having common goals. NPOs were also less likely to have members who held elective or appointive office, or who were active in political campaigns.[2] Our data indicate that 81 percent of NPOs had scores of 2 or less on our index of group tactics, which included items concerning coalition formation and protest actions of group members. In contrast, 60 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups had scores of 2 or more on this index. Yet, as will be described in Sec. V, this index is among the most important predictors of group effectiveness for both ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups.

We visited a typical example of an insular, education-oriented NPO in an eastern city which is not yet implementing desegregation. While other non-ESAA-funded groups formed umbrella organizations and prepared human relations training sessions for parents and students, this NPO ran a center that tutored students with school problems. The

---

[1] *Group tactics* is an additive index composed of two variables
- What a group has done in the event of disagreement with school district policy is an additive variable:
  - 0 = Group has a policy of not getting involved with school district policy or there has never been such a disagreement
  - 1 = Spoken at school board meetings
  - 1 = Written letters to the school board or media
  - 1 = Had private discussions with school district staff
  - 1 = Other tactics
  - 3 = Brought suit against the district
- Whether a group has formed coalition with other groups pursuing similar ends is a single variable:
  - 0 = Never formed such a coalition or no other groups pursuing similar ends
  - 1 = Has formed such a coalition

[2] Member or staff political activity is an additive variable:
- 1 = Hold elective or appointive office
- 1 = Active in political campaigns

center, whose director was a teacher, served about 125 students a year. The director felt that group goals were not related to the current desegregation activity, and feared that the group's involvement might reduce its effectiveness in delivering educational services. Many people who were active in desegregation in the district were not aware of the group's existence until, with some hesitancy, it joined the newly created umbrella organization.

Another NPO, which ran a program of intercultural enrichment activities, had a track record of political activities in the black community. At the time of our visit, however, the group was completely uninvolved in the protests surrounding the new desegregation plan, which many felt would discriminate against blacks. The group had been asked by both the local League of Women Voters chapter and by an independent neighborhood group which had formed around the issue to join in lobbying efforts and a lawsuit to change the plan. The director was afraid that such involvement might threaten NPO funding, since the group depended on letters of support from the district. Its lack of involvement in the protests against the plan had hurt its credibility in the black community.

The low level of organized citizen action among NPOs and the strong role of organized citizen action in predicting higher group outcomes for both ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups suggest that NPO outcomes are likely to be smaller than those for other community groups. The results of our outcome analysis, described below, indicate that failure to engage in organized activity outside the group plays an important role in predicting NPO outcomes.

Group Outcomes

Outcome Score. NPOs tended to score in the moderate range of our overall group impact measure.[1] Out of a possible 12 points, 78 percent of NPOs scored between 4 and 7. In contrast, non-ESAA-funded groups tended to have more low scores and more high scores (see Table 8).

---

[1]The measurement of group impact is detailed in Sec. I.

Table 8

OUTCOME SCORES FOR COMMUNITY GROUPS BY FUNDING SOURCE[a]

Group	Point Score		
	0-3	4-7	8-12
Non-ESAA-funded (N=71)	25	37	38
ESAA-funded (N=59)	15	78	7

[a]Cell entry is percentage of all groups in funding category receiving an outcome score in the specified range.

A major reason for the moderate outcomes of NPOs is their activity choices. The educational activities engaged in by the overwhelming majority of NPOs tend to be limited in their scope and in the size of their clientele. In general, they are successful in changing the achievement or attitudes of some participants, but this is no assurance that these changes will be enduring. The typical outcome of a tutoring activity was scored on the basis of reports from principals, teachers, and/or parents. These respondents were nearly always able to point to some observable change in at least one or two tutored students, but could not make a general statement about program effectiveness. Rarely was a respondent unable to describe at least one "success" partly attributable to the specific tutoring activity. However, in many cases, the respondent described the tutoring program as but one of a number of interventions in the learning process of children served by the program. Therefore, the changes they reported could not be attributed solely to the tutoring program. Thus, positive outcomes of tutoring programs may be somewhat *overstated*. In many cases, a positive group outcome was scored on the basis of a change of uncertain duration in a small number of children.

Outcome Stage. As described in Sec. II, one aspect of our outcome measure was stage of implementation of the change. Change could be scored as fully implemented, as a relatively permanent change in individual attitudes or achievement, as "in process" or transitory, or as having brought about a change in the community's and/or decision-makers' awareness.

The uncertain duration of NPO impacts is underscored by coder judgments of the stage of implementation of group outcomes. Eighty percent of NPO outcomes were scored as producing a change in awareness or "in process." Only 20 percent of NPO outcomes were judged to be relatively permanent.[1] In contrast, 66 percent of non-ESAA-funded group outcomes were scored as "in process" or as producing a change in awareness, while 34 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups were judged to have produced a relatively permanent or fully implemented change.

Community respondents predicted the moderate success of NPOs. When coders scored NPO outcomes in terms of community expectations, 60 percent of NPO outcomes were seen by respondents as consistent with expectations for the group.[2] Only 12 percent of NPOs were viewed as less successful than expected. Non-ESAA-funded group outcomes were slightly less likely than those of NPOs to live up to community expectations, although the difference was not significant: 54 percent of non-ESAA-funded group outcomes were judged by community respondents to be about what was expected; 24 percent of

---

[1]Of these, 82 percent represented "relatively permanent change in student achievement," and only 18 percent represented fully implemented systemic change. Coders were instructed to regard any change in achievement of more than a year's duration as "relatively permanent." In contrast, most of the permanent change attributed to non-ESAA funded groups was fully implemented. These differences reflect again the greater involvement of NPOs in educational service activities.

[2]The extent to which group outcomes met community expectations was measured by a single variable:

1 = Less than expected;
2 = Consistent with expectations;
3 = Greater than expected.

non-ESAA-funded groups as compared to only 12 percent of NPOs had group outcomes that fell short of community expectations.

Non-ESAA-funded groups were less likely than NPOs to meet community expectations because they tended to engage in high risk activities which were often more easily and clearly evaluated than the outcomes of lower risk service delivery efforts. For example, several non-ESAA-funded groups tried to change the desegregation plan or the composition of the school board. As a result, success and failure were more apparent.

Typical of a high-scoring non-ESAA-funded group was a League of Women Voters chapter in a small eastern town. Believing that the assumptions of the school board's desegregation plan were racist, it conducted a survey of citizens and researched the plan's aspects and underlying assumptions. Its report, which confirmed the group's suspicions, was carried in the newspapers. It served to inform citizens, create broadbased opposition to the plan, and caused the board to make several significant changes in the plan. In the same town, a newly created neighborhood group brought an unsuccessful suit against the district because of the plan's racist assumptions. The NPO in the same city was not involved in any of these activities: it conducted an after-school program of multicultural involvement.

Ambitious goals, however, did not assure a substantial impact. For instance, a League of Women Voters chapter in a midwestern city typified a low scoring non-ESAA-funded group. This group was lobbying for the district to bring more schools into compliance with the desegregation plan and to apply for federal funds to aid desegregation efforts. Its efforts were central to desegregation, but at the time of our visit, the group had not been able to bring about change of any type.

Desegregation-Relatedness of Outcomes. The activities of NPOs were slightly less likely to have facilitated desegregation than did those of non-ESAA-funded groups, but these differences were not

significant[1]: 30 percent of NPOs (40 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups) had impacts that were judged to facilitate desegregation. NPOs tended either to have no effect on desegregation (37 percent) or to be engaged in activities that helped to remedy the effects of minority isolation (33 percent). In contrast, non-ESAA-funded groups tended to have outcomes that either had no effect on desegregation (47 percent) or that facilitated desegregation (40 percent). These findings are consistent with community views of NPOs. Fifty-two percent of NPOs were viewed as less likely than other groups in their communities to address desegregation or minority isolation problems. Only 16 percent were viewed as more likely than other groups in their communities to address these problems.[2]

Community perceptions that NPOs tended not to address desegregation or minority isolation problems largely reflected NPO activity choices and their potential impact on desegregation. NPOs tended to remedy the effect of minority isolation rather than facilitate desegregation because most of them delivered educational services. These activities were generally designed to improve the achievement of minority students.[3]

---

[1]The measure of the relationship of change to desegregation is described in more detail in Sec. I. It is a single variable:

0 = Had no effect on desegregation or minority isolation
1 = Reduced minority isolation
2 = Facilitated desegregation

[2]Community judgment of NPO relationship to desegregation was measured by a single variable:

1 = Less likely than other community groups to address desegregation or minority isolation problems
2 = About as likely as other groups in the community to address these problems
3 = More likely to address these problems

[3]Theoretically, achievement gains among minority students might facilitate desegregation. For example, if high school students were tracked according to ability, substantial gains among black students could result in the integration of previously all-white high ability tracks. However, in most cases, tracking does not exist and gains are small.

Non-ESAA-funded groups tended not to reduce minority isolation or its effects because this was generally not a group goal.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As shown in Table 9, NPOs differ from non-ESAA-funded groups on a number of dimensions. NPOs overwhelmingly choose to engage in educational service activities, which are typically delivered by a middle class staff to lower SES clients, usually minority students. Choice of educational activity is independent of district desegregation context or district financial capacity.

ESAA-funded groups tend to have moderate outcomes in contrast to non-ESAA-funded groups, whose outcomes tend to be either very modest or very large. This finding reflects the lower risk, lower payoff activities NPOs tend to select. Their predominantly educational activities tend to reduce minority isolation, but have less effect on facilitating desegregation. Again, outcomes for ESAA-funded groups are less likely to have large, permanent effects on desegregation. Rather, they tend to reduce minority isolation by reliably bringing about small to moderate changes in the achievement or attitudes of limited numbers of individuals.

NPOs differ organizationally from groups not funded by ESAA. They tend to be more recently established and to have more material resources than non-ESAA-funded groups. In contrast to non-ESAA-funded groups, NPOs tend to eschew organized citizen action. They are less likely than other groups to form coalitions or to protest school district policy.

Table 9

SUMMARY OF TYPICAL ESAA-FUNDED AND NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	NPOs	Non-ESAA-Funded Groups
Age of district desegregation plan	Old	New
Group age	Young	Old
Group type	No members	Membership group
Staff	2 or more paid staff	No paid staff and volunteers
Leader/staff social class	Middle class	Middle class
Fit between leader/staff and client/member social class	Social class of staff and client different	Social class of leaders and members same
Material resources	High	Low
Receives LEA assistance	Yes	No
Group visibility	Low	High
Dominant activity type	Educational services	Advocacy activities
Involvement in desegregation-specific activities	No	Yes
Racial mix of group clientele	One race	Multi-racial
Involvement in organized citizen action	Not involved	Has protested district policy; has formed coalitions
Member politicization	Low	High
Group outcome score	Moderate	Either very high or very low
Relationship of impact to desegregation	Reduced minority isolation	Facilitated desegregation

IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXTUAL FACTORS IN EXPLAINING COMMUNITY GROUP RESOURCES AND CHOICE BEHAVIOR

It is widely agreed that there is a close relationship between contextual factors and individual and group behavior, which frequently aids in predicting social outcomes. Studies of school politics and governance confirm the connection between community characteristics and school policy. For example, Minar found that higher status communities experienced less community conflict over the schools than communities of lower status. Litt found that the class structure of a community influenced its curricular policies, and Dye found that variations in per-pupil expenditures were primarily a function of per capita income and to a lesser extent, levels of urbanization, industrialization, and adult education.[1]

Zeigler, Jennings, and Peak report that contextual factors influence the behavior and strength of interest groups concerned with education. Level of community support for board policies and degree of metropolitanism were particularly strong predictors of group visibility. The presence of controversial issues in the community (e.g., racial problems) also increased the likelihood that interest groups would come to the attention of the school board.[2] Fainstein and Fainstein report that a large number of groups in a given community facilitates the functioning of any individual group. A multiplicity of groups holds potential power to form coalitions or mobilize support around issues of mutual concern.[3]

---

[1] D. Minar, "Community Basis of Conflict in School System Politics," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 31, 1966, pp. 822-835; E. Litt, "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 28, 1963, pp. 69-75; T. R. Dye, *Politics, Economics and the Public: Policy Outcomes in the American States*, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1966.

[2] L. H. Ziegler, M. K. Jennings, and G. W. Peak, *Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts*, Duxbury Press, North Scituate, Massachusetts, 1974.

[3] N. Fainstein and S. Fainstein, "The Future of Community Control," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 70, 1976, pp. 905-923.

A number of studies of school desegregation have confirmed the importance of contextual factors in determining when desegregation became an issue and how it was resolved. For example, Kirby, Harris, Crain, and Rossell found that mayoral support, school board conflict surrounding desegregation, elite support, and superintendent leadership were all strongly related to district action taken to desegregate.[1]

Although no study of school desegregation directly addresses the role of community groups in facilitating desegregation, the consistent association between contextual factors and a wide range of school and group outcomes led us to believe that contextual factors would be significant predictors of community group resources, behavior, and impact.

The following assumptions underlie our belief that contextual variables would be important in understanding the behavior of community groups involved in desegregation-related activities:

1. Community groups, which are small and resource-poor relative to school districts, will alter their activities and strategies so that they can maximize the likelihood of effecting change in the larger institution.
2. Groups involved in desegregation-related activities will be particularly responsive to the district desegregation context. These groups will look to the nature of the desegregation activity in the district in order to define problems, activities, and goals.
3. Groups will generally aim for some change in the desegregation context or in district policy or behavior. They will therefore need to pay close attention to the structure and behavior of these institutions.
4. Most groups in the sample will exhibit one or more of these characteristics. Few groups will be insular, inflexible, or bureaucratized. Few will direct their activities to individual level rather than institutional change.

---

[1] David Kirby, T. Robert Harris, Robert Crain, and Christine Rossell, *Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation*, D. C. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1973.

RELEVANT VARIABLES

Previous studies of school desegregation and community group behavior have identified a number of contextual variables that predict desegregation outcomes. As indicated in the preceding section, among the most important variables are: mayoral involvement, school board conflict surrounding desegregation, elite support, superintendent leadership,[1] and black economic status.[2]

School district demographic factors--size of enrollment, percent black enrollment, and per pupil expenditures--have been found to predict a range of desegregation outcomes. Wegner and Mercer found that moderate-sized districts with relatively small numbers of minority students were more likely to have adopted a variety of desegregation policies. They also found that districts with higher per pupil spending levels were more likely to have actually desegregated.[3]

Our own exploratory fieldwork suggested several other potentially important contextual variables. One was white acceptance of the inevitability of desegregation. Respondents reported that such acceptance lowered the threat of violence, and allowed efforts to be devoted to peaceful plan implementation. Another was the district's stance toward community efforts. More open districts seemed to be more receptive to community group ideas and responsive to their demands.

The analyses in this section of the relationship between aspects of community and school district context and community group resources and choice behavior include four categories of contextual variables and two clusters of group factors that are used as control variables. The individual variables and the indices constructed from them that are used in these analyses are given in Table 10. Appendix C contains a detailed description of all contextual variables.

---

[1]Kirby et al., op. cit., p. 142.

[2]Christine Rossell and Robert Crain, "The Political and Social Determinants of School Desegregation Policy," unpublished paper, 1975.

[3]E. Wegner and Jane Mercer, "Dynamics of the Desegregation Process: Politics, Policies, and Community Characteristics as Factors in Change," in Frederick M. Wirt (ed.), *The Polity of the School*, D. C. Heath, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1975, pp. 123-144.

Table 10

VARIABLES AND INDICES
USED IN ANALYSES

School District Political and Organizational Characteristics

Individual Variables
- School board disagreement on desegregation
- District openness to community groups

Indices[a]
- Public support for the schools
  - General public's involvement with the schools
  - Perceived quality of public schools
- Elite concern for the schools
  - Salience of education to elites
  - Elite perception of relationship between school quality and own self-interest

Local Desegregation Context

Individual Items
- Percent of students reassigned under mandatory aspects of the desegregation plan
- Year of the most recent plan
- White perception of desegregation inevitability

Indices
- Civic and school district leader support for desegregation
  - Mayor's public desegregation position
  - School superintendent's public desegregation position
  - White leaders' attitudes on desegregation
- Net group support for desegregation
  - Status of groups supporting desegregation
  - Status of groups opposing desegregation

Community Group Resources

Individual Items
- Source of major group funding

Indices
- Level of material resources
  - Current annual operating budget
  - Number of paid staff
- Level of group leader influence independent of group
  - Group visibility
  - Group press coverage

Community Group Choice of Tactics and Activities

Individual Items
- Choice of education-related activity
- Choice of advocacy activity
- Choice of desegregation-related activity

Indices
- Group tactics
- Political activity of group members
- Whether group has formed coalitions

---

[a]Individual variables that make up the indices are listed under the index name.

FINDINGS

As discussed in Sec. III, ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups vary on a number of important dimensions, including resources, choice of tactics and choice of activities. Therefore, in assessing the impact of contextual factors on aspects of group resources and behavior, separate analyses were done on ESAA-funded and non-ESAA-funded groups.[1]

The Effect of Context on Level of Group Resources

We expected that socioeconomic and political characteristics of the city would affect level of group resources, reasoning that more affluent communities would provide more money to finance group efforts. Citizens would also have a greater stake in smoothing the implementation of a desegregation plan. Or, in the absence of wealth, powerful minorities--by dint of numbers or high political or economic status--would use political pressure to gain support for black causes, including community groups involved in desegregation.

We expected that city characteristics would also affect the level of community support for groups supporting desegregation. For example, a strong minority community would be more likely to supply highly competent, influential leaders to community groups. A powerful minority community might also assure that groups received press coverage.

Finally, we expected that city wealth might influence the sources of financial support for community groups, although the direction of this relationship was unclear. In wealthy areas, private support might be easier to obtain. Yet, in wealthier cities, groups and group leaders would be more likely to develop grantsmanship skills.

---

[1] In the analyses to follow, the number of cases with missing data vary depending on the pattern of missing data among variables included in a given equation. Substantially reduced Ns in some analyses may be a result of several factors:

- o In the case of district-level data, a missing datum had a multiplicative effect since district-level data applied to each group in the district.
- o On the desegregation-related variables, some missing data was the legitimate result of the fact that desegregation was not an issue or a desegregation plan did not exist in a given district.

Our findings indicate, however, that socioeconomic and political characteristics of the city had no effect on level of group resources (see Tables 11 and 12). Our data did not support the expected relationship between community wealth and level of community group resources. Clearly, some groups in even the wealthiest and most egalitarian communities had few resources, while in the poorest, most discriminatory communities some groups were resource-rich.

The Effect of Context on Group Tactics and Choice of Activities

As discussed in Sec. II, we expected that local desegregation context, LEA political and organizational characteristics, and level of group resources might all have direct effects on group choice of tactics and strategies.

Since the groups in our sample were selected because of their involvement with desegregation, we assumed they would be sensitive to aspects of the desegregation context in selecting activities and strategies. Indeed, our "ideal" group would commit itself to addressing one or more aspects of the local desegregation situation. For example, if there was little knowledge of or public support for desegregation, our "ideal" group might begin an information campaign designed to inform and allay fears. Or, if most whites believed that resistance would eventually choke off desegregation, an "ideal" group might seek to convince people of its inevitability.

We expected LEA political and organizational characteristics would be important because they might constrain group activity choices. For example, if the LEA were unresponsive, attempts at cooperation might prove futile as compared to public protest tactics. Or, if elites cared little about the public schools, group activities designed to elicit elite support of desegregation would probably be ill-advised.

Finally, we expected group resources to strongly affect choice of tactics and activities. Resources--or lack of them--impose real constraints on what groups can do. Lack of funds may keep a group from acting, while abundance of funds, particularly with strings attached, may make the group more conservative.

Table 11

EFFECT OF COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS AND ASPECTS OF LOCAL DESEGREGATION CONTEXT ON LEVEL OF GROUP RESOURCES IN NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUPS[a]

Independent Variable	Standard Regression Coefficient For: Material Resources	Nonmaterial Resources	Source of Major Funding
Economic and Political Characteristics of the Community			
Objective economic status	.42	.48	-.25
Subjective economic status	.14	.20	-.23
Community population	.31	.47	-.36
Percent black population	.26	.29	-.10
Region	.29	.66	-.53
Black political status	.03	.09	-.20
Black economic status	-.07	.02	.05
Desegregation Context			
Percent students reassigned	-.54	-.88*	.23
Year of most recent plan	-.34	-.25	.34
White perception of desegregation inevitability	-.65*	-.55	.49
Leader support for desegregation†			
Net group support for desegregation	.06	.15	.41*
R^2	.28	.25	.41
Number of observations	39	39	39

Significance for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

†The inclusion of this variable in this set of analyses was not possible because of low N.

[a]Note that in some cases the difference between coefficients for NPOs and non-NPOs is significant, although neither the NPO coefficient nor that for non-NPOs is itself significantly different from zero. Although for some purposes these differences may be important, we have chosen not to interpret them. The reason for this decision is straightforward: in reality groups rarely move from one category to the other.

Our field work indicated that federal policymakers and federal funds do not change group activity choices or behavior. Although possible in theory, groups whose activities or strategies are inconsistent with NPO program regulations rarely change their behavior to secure NPO funds. Groups whose prior activities are consistent with funding criteria--or that were formed to secure NPO funding--do not substantially change their behavior. NPO funding simply supplements--or provides--their resources.

The effect of the NPO program is generally to bring new groups into existence or to supplement the resources of an existing group: our fieldwork encountered no group that had undertaken major reorientation of its activities in order to secure ESAA-NPO funding. The two sets of groups--NPOs and non-NPOs--come from quite different populations. They operate on the district's problems in somewhat different ways and they respond to a different degree to district contextual characteristics. The extent of the coefficients' difference from zero, rather than the size of the difference between coefficients, shows this most clearly.

Table 12

EFFECT OF COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS AND ASPECTS OF LOCAL DESEGREGATION CONTEXT ON LEVEL OF GROUP RESOURCES IN NPOs[a]

Independent Variable	Standard Regression Coefficient For: Material Resources	Nonmaterial Resources	Source of Major Funding
Economic and Political Characteristics of the Community			
Objective economic status	-.05	-.16	.18
Subjective economic status	.26	-.13	-.39
Community population	.57	-.33	-.29
Percent black population	.20	-.50	-.28
Region	.44	-.36	-.53
Black political status	.35	.50	-.23
Black economic status	.27	-.17	-.15
Desegregation Context			
Percent students reassigned	.05	.67	.09
Year of most recent plan	-.05	.22	-.08
White perception of desegregation inevitability	.43	.53	-.18
Leader support for desegregation	.20	-.01	-.04
Net group support for desegregation	-.36	-.19	-.22
R^2	.35	.52	.42
Number of observations	26	26	27

Significance for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

[a]Note that in some cases the difference between coefficients for NPOs and non-NPOs is significant, although neither the NPO coefficient nor that for non-NPOs is itself significantly different from zero. Although for some purposes these differences may be important, we have chosen not to interpret them. The reason for this decision is straightforward: in reality groups rarely move from one category to the other.

Our fieldwork indicated that federal policymakers and federal funds do not change group activity choices or behavior. Although possible in theory, groups whose activities or strategies are inconsistent with NPO program regulations rarely change their behavior to secure NPO funds. Groups whose prior activities are consistent with funding criteria--or that were formed to secure NPO funding--do not substantially change their behavior. NPO funding simply supplements--or provides--their resources.

The effect of the NPO program is generally to bring new groups into existence or to supplement the resources of an existing group: our fieldwork encountered no group which had undertaken major reorientation of its activities in order to secure ESAA-NPO funding. The two sets of groups--NPOs and non-NPOs --come from quite different populations. They operate on the district's problems in somewhat different ways and they respond to a different degree to district contextual characteristics. The extent of the coefficients' difference from zero, rather than the size of the difference between coefficients, shows this most clearly.

Local Desegregation Context. We found that LEA political and organizational characteristics had little effect on group choice of activities or tactics for either ESAA-funded or non-ESAA-funded groups (see Table 10). However, aspects of the local desegregation context were significant predictors of group activity choices for non-ESAA-funded groups. In districts with recent plans, white acceptance of desegregation inevitability, and lack of leader support, non-ESAA-funded groups tend toward advocacy (see Table 13; for ESAA-funded groups, see Table 14).

These findings suggest that in selecting activities, non-ESAA-funded groups do pay some attention to the local desegregation context. In districts with newer plans, non-ESAA-funded groups tend to select advocacy activities (Table 13). These activities appear appropriate for recently desegregated districts, where desegregation is often a salient issue.

The relationship between plan age and choice of advocacy activities among non-ESAA-funded groups is bolstered by the "meteor groups" which we found in almost every currently desegregating or recently desegregated district. These groups, recently established in response to problems arising in the course of desegregation,[1] were expected to disband once the problems were resolved or no longer salient. They often disseminated information and worked on rumor control; in some cases, they sought to affect the plan directly. For example, a neighborhood-based group in one district was established to protest the school board's newest desegregation plan. The plan would have closed the neighborhood school to facilitate desegregation. The group raised money, hired a lawyer, and sued the district, arguing that the plan was racist.

In another preimplementation district, leaders of a meteor group established to develop support for peaceful implementation of the desegregation plan felt that such a campaign would be necessary for

[1]Meteor groups were rarely ESAA-funded. In many cases, meteor groups had been established since the close of the last ESAA funding cycle and therefore had been unable to apply for ESAA funds.

Table 13

EFFECT OF LOCAL DESEGREGATION CONTEXT, GROUP RESOURCES, AND LEA POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS ON NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUP STRATEGY AND ACTIVITY CHOICES

	Standard Regression Coefficient For:			
Independent Variable	Group Tactics	Education Activities	Advocacy Activities	Desegregation Related Activities
Desegregation Context				
Percent students reassigned	.17	-.11	.07	-.02
Year of most recent plan	.01	.43	-.58**	-.35
White perception of desegregation inevitability	.13	.40	.81**	-.37
Leader support for desegregation	.05	.08	-.72**	.19
Net group support for desegregation	-.00	-.02	.01	-.05
Group Resources				
Material resources	-.00	.42*	.08	-.48*
Nonmaterial resources	.23	.08	.02	.01
Source of major funding	.05	-.48*	.22	.12
School District Characteristics				
Public support for the schools	-.01	.07	-.13	-.21
Elite concern for the schools	-.12	.10	-.10	-.04
School board disagreement on desegregation	-.03	.24	-.14	.12
Openness of the LEA to community group input	-.07	-.17	-.20	-.02
R^2	.12	.32	.45***	.36
Number of observations	40	40	40	40

Significance for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level
*** = .10 level

Table 14

EFFECT OF LOCAL DESEGREGATION CONTEXT, GROUP RESOURCES, AND LEA POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS ON NPO STRATEGY AND ACTIVITY CHOICES[a]

Independent Variable	Standard Regression Coefficient For: Group Tactics	Education Activities	Advocacy Activities	Desegregation Related Activities
Desegregation Context				
Percent students reassigned	.00	.27	-.16	.03
Year of most recent plan	-.24	.07	-.06	-.17
White perception of desegregation inevitability	.36*	-.08	-.35*	.13
Leader support for desegregation	-.08	.03	-.08	.06
Net group support for desegregation	.14	-.24	.13	.02
Group Resources				
Material resources	.12	-.15	-.02	-.23
Nonmaterial resources	.28	-.21	.37*	.04
Source of major funding	-.06	.03	.01	.29
School District Characteristics				
Public support for the schools	.09	.20	-.03	.01
Elite concern for the schools	.09	.35*	-.10	.00
School board disagreement on desegregation	-.07	.17	-.19	-.01
Openness of the LEA to community group inputs	.27	.08	-.27	-.08
R^2	.42	.35	.41	.20
Number of observations	41	41	41	41

Significance for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

[a]Note that in some cases the difference between coefficients for NPOs and non-NPOs is significant, although neither the NPO coefficient nor that for non-NPOs is itself significantly different from zero. Although for some purposes these differences may be important, we have chosen not to interpret them. The reason for this decision is straightforward: in reality groups rarely move from one category to the other.

Our fieldwork indicated that federal policymakers and federal funds do not change group activity choices or behavior. Although possible in theory, groups whose activities or strategies are inconsistent with NPO program regulations rarely change their behavior to secure NPO funds. Groups whose prior activities are consistent with funding criteria--or that were formed to secure NPO funding--do not substantially change their behavior. NPO funding simply supplements--or provides--their resources.

The effect of the NPO program is generally to bring new groups into existence or to supplement the resources of an existing group: our fieldwork encountered no group that had undertaken major reorientation of its activities in order to secure ESAA-NPO funding. The two sets of groups--NPOs and non-NPOs--come from quite different populations. They operate on the district's problems in somewhat different ways and they respond to a different degree to district contextual characteristics. The extent of the coefficients' difference from zero, rather than the size of the difference between coefficients, shows this most clearly.

successful and peaceful desegregation. At the time of our visit, the project was on "hold," awaiting just the right time to go public.

The finding that less leader support is associated with choice of advocacy activity by non-ESAA-funded groups suggests that advocacy may be selected as a means to increase leader support. Although not statistically significant, the relationship between inevitability and selection of advocacy activities may be due in part to the fact that advocacy activities are much more likely in poorer districts, where white acceptance of the inevitability of desegregation is higher. More directly, white acceptance may make advocacy activities more feasible and more likely to succeed.

White acceptance of desegregation inevitability was the rationale behind selection of an advocacy activity by an organization we visited in a southern city. This group had been only peripherally involved with the schools in the past; its major organizational task had been fostering the economic vitality of the city. When the desegregation plan had been implemented and generally accepted, the group decided to devote some effort to improving the quality of desegregated schooling by promoting the magnet high schools called for in the desegregation plan. The group devoted time, funds, and expertise to locating appropriate sites and equipping these schools. Group members also organized a speakers' bureau to recruit students for the new magnet programs.

DISCUSSION

Our findings indicate that aspects of city and LEA context do not explain community group characteristics or behavior. The only exception to this pattern was the finding that aspects of the local desegregation context did predict choice of advocacy activities, but only for non-ESAA-funded groups. One reason for this finding that advocacy groups are more sensitive to desegregation context is that groups engaged in advocacy activities are closer to our "model" group described earlier. Their goal is to change a considerably larger, more established institution, and therefore they must pay closer attention to relevant contextual factors. This effect is not significant for NPOs because the vast majority deliver educational services.[1]

[1]See Sec. III for further discussion of this point.

The lack of a relationship between contextual factors and group resources, tactics, and, for NPOs, choice of activities is inconsistent with the results of a range of earlier studies. The independence of group characteristics and behavior from community context can be partially explained by the range of groups we found in most districts, their organizational histories, and the nature and locus of their funding sources. The inconsistency between our findings and that of other studies may also be due in part to the different dependent variable we used. While most relevant studies predicted to group activities or district desegregation actions, our study focused on group outcomes.

Group Funding Sources

Our fieldwork and data suggest that in our sample there are two group types, which are distinguished by level and source of funds. The high correlation between level of material resources and source of major funding lends credence to this notion of group typologies. The correlation indicates that in general, groups with high levels of material resources tend to obtain these resources from extra-district, governmental agencies. Groups with lower levels of material resources tend to rely on local (nongovernmental) sources of support.

As shown in Table 13, only those groups that did not receive ESAA-NPO funding were significantly influenced by the desegregation context in selecting group activities. The reduced sensitivity of NPOs to local context is understandable in terms of their major source of funds. Outside funding sources tend to be less concerned about variations in local conditions.[1]

Representatives of these two group types were present in every school district we visited. This consistent variation helps to explain the lack of relationship we found between socioeconomic and political characteristics of the community and level or type of group resources.

[1]For example, ESAA-NPO grants are made on the basis of proposal quality (which includes a general needs assessment) and statistical points (e.g., percent of minority students in the district). No attempt is made to judge the appropriateness of fit between proposed activities and local desegregation context. The approval process for NPO proposals is discussed in detail in Vol. I of this report.

Group Tactics

Local desegregation context was a poor predictor of group tactics. A major reason is that many groups have established tactics which they apply regardless of the particular issue involved. Only a few groups, mainly those recently established to aid in desegregation, selected tactics in response to contextual realities. The foremost example of a group with established tactics is the League of Women Voters. While local chapters pursue different issues across communities and over time, their tactics--which are established as a part of national policy--are remarkably consistent. All chapters follow the same format: the selected issue is carefully researched; a report is written which includes specific recommendations; and the chapter activity lobbies to have those recommendations adopted by the targeted agency. Many other groups in our sample, both nationally affiliated and local, had also adopted a policy for group tactics which they applied consistently to a changing set of activities.

Conclusions

These explanations are not adequate to explain the overall lack of relationship between aspects of community context and community group resources tactics, and activity choices. Therefore, the inconsistency between our findings and those of studies reported in the literature cannot be completely explained. Use of a different dependent variable may be an important contributor to this observed inconsistency. However, this explanation cannot be pursued analytically.

The results of our study, then, indicate that community context is not an important predictor of group resources and behavior. Far more important in understanding group behavior and outcomes were characteristics of the groups themselves. These relationships are described in Sec. V.

V. COMMUNITY GROUPS: RESOURCES AND STRATEGIES

The factors most directly affecting a community group's impact are those internal to the organization--namely, its resources and choice of tactics and activities. Other studies have identified the following kinds of resources as important to a group's success: financial resources, quality of organizational leadership, visibility in the community, and access to the media.[1] An adequate level and mix of organizational resources, however, does not of itself guarantee a group's success. The way a group uses its resources is at least as important. Consequently, in assessing the determinants of a community group's impact, it is necessary to examine the group's strategy, including:

- What an organization does when it disagrees with public policies relevant to its own goals.
- The ability and willingness of the group to coalesce with other organizations pursuing similar aims.
- The group's choice of organizational activities.

In other words, a group's strategy is the way it chooses to use the resources available to it in order to affect the outside environment. Consequently, the level and kind of resources available to it will have a direct effect on a group's impact, but these resources will also have an indirect effect which is mediated through the group's choice of tactics and activities. We are assuming that a group's resource base is a prime determinant of its choice of strategy and that strategy and resource variables together determine the size of a group's impact.

As in the previous section, these hypotheses can be tested with multiple regression procedures. Because ESAA-NPOs differ greatly from non-ESAA-funded groups, we ran separate regressions for NPOs and non-NPOs. The results of our first regression equation (Tables 15 and 16)

[1] For example, see Edie N. Goldenberg, *Making the Papers*, Lexington Books, Lexington, Massachusetts, 1975, Chap. 4.

Table 15

EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCE FACTORS ON AN ESAA-NPO's CHOICE OF TACTICS AND ACTIVITIES

	Standardized Regression Coefficient For:			
Independent Variable	Group Tactics	Group Delivers Educational Services	Group Engages in Advocacy-Type Activities	Group Engages in Desegregation-Specific Activities
Material resources	.19	-.04	-.11	-.27
Nonmaterial resources	.31*	-.39**	.49**	.14
Competence of group leader	-.23	.13	-.18	-.05
Whether group has members	.15	.30*	-.02	-.17
R^2	.24	.14[a]	.21	.09[a]
Number of observations	51	51	51	51

Significance for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

[a]These equations are not significant at a level of .05 or above.

Table 16

EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCE FACTORS ON A NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUP'S CHOICE OF TACTICS AND ACTIVITIES

Independent Variable	Standardized Regression Coefficient For: Group Tactics	Group Delivers Educational Services	Group Engages in Advocacy-Type Activities	Group Engages in Desegregation-Specific Activities
Material resources	.04	.10	.03	-.32**
Nonmaterial resources	.19	.03	-.02	.04
Competence of group leader	.18	.03	.11	.01
Whether group has members	.33**	-.38**	.31*	.06
R^2	.17	.19	.09[a]	.12[a]
Number of observations	63	63	63	63

Significance for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

[a]These equations are not significant at a level of .05 or above.

show the effect of resource variables on a group's choice of tactics and activities. Findings based on a second equation (Tables 17 and 18) indicate the effect of group resources and strategy on group impact.

The discussion in Sec. III outlined important differences in the organizational profiles of ESAA-NPOs and non-ESAA-funded groups. Yet we found that the most significant predictors of high group impact were the same regardless of ESAA funding status. Those NPOs and their non-ESAA-funded counterparts that produced the greatest impact chose to engage in advocacy activities, were willing to take a public stand against school district policies with which they disagreed, and coalesced with organizations pursuing similar aims. Given this relationship between organizational activities and group impact, it is important to consider why so few NPOs select those group activities and tactics that are the most likely to achieve a high impact. In this section we will examine this issue as part of our discussion of the role of organizational resources and strategy in explaining group impact.

ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES

Four types of organizational resources were included in our analysis: material and nonmaterial resources, whether the group has members, and the competence of the group leader. Each of these variables is discussed below.

Material Resources

Our material resources index measures an organization's annual budget, whether it has a paid staff, and the size of that staff.[1] A common assumption is that such material resources are important in explaining a group's impact: wealthy groups are more successful than poor ones. However, our analysis found that a group's level of material resources had no direct and significant effect on group impact.[2]

[1]The indices used in this section are described in Secs. III, IV, and Appendix C.

[2]The measurement of group impact is detailed in Sec. II.

Table 17

EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES AND STRATEGY FACTORS
ON AN ESAA-NPO's IMPACT

Independent Variable	Overall Group Impact	Standardized Regression Coefficient For: Level and Scope of Change	Degree of Implementation	Relationship of Change to Desegregation
Material resources	-.06	.03	.14	-.05
Nonmaterial resources	.15	.00	.07	.27
Competence of group leader	-.02	-.15	.04	.13
Whether group has members	-.07	.26*	.16	-.18
Group tactics	.27*	-.14	.14	.02
Group delivers educational services	.20	-.19	.30	.36
Group engages in advocacy-type activities	.53**	.46**	.15	.32
Group engages in desegregation-specific activities	.01	.11	-.14	.10
R^2	.28	.46	.20[a]	.23[a]
Number of observations	51	51	51	51

Significance is for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

[a]These equations are not significant at a level of .05 or above.

Table 18

EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES AND STRATEGY FACTORS
ON A NON-ESAA-FUNDED GROUP'S IMPACT

Independent Variable	Standardized Regression Coefficient For: Overall Group Impact	Level and Scope of Change	Degree of Implementation	Relationship of Change to Desegregation
Material resources	.01	-.04	.06	-.19
Nonmaterial resources	.18	.26**	.14	-.18
Competence of group leader	.30**	.21	.43**	.08
Whether group has members	-.02	-.09	.03	.18
Group tactics	.27**	.13	.10	.12
Group delivers educational services	.09	-.11	.20	.16
Group engages in advocacy-type activities	.32**	.46**	.22	.18
Group engages in desegregation-specific activities	.13	.19	-.01	.33*
R^2	.43	.45	.41	.26[a]
Number of observations	63	63	63	63

Significance is for a standard two-tailed t-test:
* = .05 level
** = .01 level

[a]These equations are not significant at a level of .05 or above.

In examining the role of material resources in an organization's choice of activities, we found that resource-rich non-ESAA-funded groups were unlikely to engage in desegregation-specific activities. However, this finding is based on a nonsignificant equation and needs to be interpreted with caution. At the same time, our fieldwork observations did indicate that wealthier groups are often reluctant to engage in desegregation-specific activities because they are less willing than poorer groups to take risks.

Groups that were able to secure large budgets tended to choose rather cautious activities which produced a certain, though low to moderate, impact. On the other hand, groups with fewer resources were more willing to engage in high-risk activities, precisely because they had less to lose. Because desegregation-specific activities require substantial effort with a relatively low chance of success, they can be classified as high-risk.

For example, in one midwestern city we visited, a small neighborhood group with no staff or budget was involved in filing the desegregation suit, shaping the consent decree, and in general monitoring school district operations. This group, with an all-black membership, was willing to engage in such high-risk activities because it was deeply committed to the belief that the burden of desegregation should not fall overwhelmingly on black students. While the group would welcome a modest level of funding to establish a community information center, it now chooses to direct its efforts toward pressing the desegregation suit rather than soliciting funds.

In comparison, another community group in the same city had a budget of approximately $250,000 and ran an alternative school. Its response to desegregation was to sponsor an outdoor education program which involved about seventy public school students.

These two groups present a striking contrast. Both were faced with the same community context--a school district with racially isolated schools and an impending need for desegregation. One chose to attempt to change the school system by involving itself with the desegregation suit--a fruitless activity had the community group lost their case. The other group, with greater material resources, chose

to deal with the problem of racial isolation by bringing together a small number of students for a week-long program of outdoor education. While the resulting changes in students' attitudes would be small and transitory (particularly with no follow-up activities to reinforce these changes), the group could at least claim some level of success.

Contrary to common belief, then, we did not find that wealthier organizations had a greater impact. Rather, a group's material resource level had no direct effect on group impact and was important only in predicting whether or not it engaged in desegregation-specific activities.

Nonmaterial Resources

Because resources other than material ones can be important in determining a community group's behavior, we included an index of nonmaterial resources. This index consisted of three variables: a group's visibility in the community, the extent of newspaper coverage received by the group, and whether or not the group's leader had personal influence independent of his/her role as organizational leader.[1] Our assumption was that resources such as visibility and leader influence could be used as a substitute if a group lacked material resources, or--for wealthier groups--these nonmaterial items could add to the group's resource base.

We found that although a group's level of nonmaterial resources had no significant effect on group impact, it was significant in predicting an NPO's choice of tactics and activities. ESAA-NPOs with a high level of nonmaterial resources were more likely to respond publicly to school district policies, coalesce with other groups, and choose advocacy-type activities[2]--precisely those organizational strategies most likely to achieve a high group impact.

---

[1]The zero-order correlation between the material and nonmaterial indices is .00.

[2]It should be noted that (1) whether a group engages in advocacy-type activities and (2) group tactics are conceptually different variables (the zero-order correlation is .25). The group tactics variable measures what an organization does to further its goals, and the way it reacts to school district policies which might hinder the achievement of those goals. On the other hand, whether a group decides to engage

The relationship between nonmaterial resources and a group's choice of those organizational strategies most likely to produce a high group impact is an important one for understanding why NPOs do not generally choose such strategies. As the analysis in Sec. III indicated, ESAA-NPOs tend to have fewer nonmaterial resources than non-ESAA-funded groups. Their leaders have less independent influence, these groups receive less press coverage, and on the whole, ESAA-NPOs maintain a much lower profile in their own communities. Consequently, ESAA-NPOs often lack the resources needed to pursue an activist group strategy. An NPO often finds it difficult to use tactics such as speaking at school board meetings or contacting the media because such actions depend on the group's having sufficient visibility to insure that it will at least have an audience for its message.

Similarly, because NPOs often do not have leaders with measureable independent influence, they lack the visibility and access needed to mobilize the community in order to change school district policies. In sum, despite a preponderance of material resources, NPOs often lack those nonmaterial resources so critical in a group's choice of a successful organizational strategy.

Competence of Group Leader

Besides the influence of the group leader, another obviously important aspect of organizational leadership is the competence of the group leader--how well he or she runs the organization.[1] We assumed that leader competence would not be an important factor in a group's choice of tactics or activities because leaders at both levels of competence would be distributed equally across groups, regardless

in advocacy-type activities is one of the ways it chooses to operationalize its goals. This variable can be thought of as a group's offensive strategy; group tactics are its defensive strategy.

[1]Although leader competence is conceptually similar to the variables included in the nonmaterial resource index, its part-whole coefficient was significantly lower than those of the variables comprising the index. Consequently, it was included as a separate variable in the regression equation.

of their activity choice.[1] On the other hand, we believed that leader competence would be a significant determinant of group impact.

In assessing the competence of a group leader, coders were asked to consider evidence of the following kind:

- How well the leader managed group resources.
- How effectively he or she managed and communicated with organizational staff.
- The quality of the leader's interaction with group members and/or clients.
- The efficiency with which group activities were pursued--in a sense, the return to a group as compared with the effort it expended.

Our analysis indicates that as we had assumed, leader competence had no significant effect on a group's choice of tactics or activities. However, for non-NPOs it had a positive and significant effect on group impact. In other words, those organizations with leaders who could efficiently manage the internal operations of the group were more likely to have a large impact than groups with less competent leaders. Leader competence was particularly important to non-NPO group impact because it was the single best predictor of the institutionalization of change brought about by such a group. The competence of the group leader was not significant, however, in predicting the impact of ESAA-NPOs.

Whether a Group Has Members

Although we had no prior notion about the effect membership would have on a group's impact, we assumed that groups with members would behave differently than those without them. We believed that membership groups would choose different types of activities from non-membership groups.

[1] In fact, we found this to be the case; tabular analysis showed that leader competence was equally distributed across all types of activities ($\chi^2 = 0.01$, n.s.).

Our analysis indicated that for non-NPOs, membership groups scored high on our group tactics index and were more likely to engage in advocacy activities than to deliver educational services. Although status as a membership group did not directly affect the impact of non-NPOs, this factor did have an indirect effect. Membership groups were much more likely to choose those strategies found to produce the highest group impact.

There was no significant equation for NPOs in which being a membership organization affected a group's choice of strategy. However, NPO membership groups were more likely to achieve a high score on the level-scope component of our impact score than were nonmembership groups. In other words, although membership NPOs did not bring about changes that were better institutionalized or more central to the desegregation process, they did affect more people than did nonmembership NPOs.

Membership status, then, has a different effect on NPOs and non-ESAA-funded groups. For both types of groups, however, membership contributed either directly or indirectly to achieving a higher group impact. The reason for this seems to be simple, and one that applies equally to NPOs and non-NPOs. In order for a group to engage in advocacy activities or to affect a large number of people, it needs legitimacy, access, and a way to multiply its resource base so as to reach more people. Group members can usually serve these functions for an organization better than a paid staff whose primary expertise is delivering services, often to a limited number of clients.

Nevertheless, only 30 percent of the NPOs in our sample were membership groups as compared to 75 percent for non-NPOs. Consequently, the majority of NPOs we examined lacked the advantages that having members can provide.

Up to this point, we have discussed the effect of group resources on a group's tactics and its choice of activities. We have also examined the effect of resources on group impact. We next analyze the effect of our strategy variables on group impact.

GROUP TACTICS AND CHOICE OF ACTIVITIES

The findings reported in this section are based on the regression equations presented in Tables 17 and 18.

Group Tactics

The analysis above indicated that when choice of group tactics is considered as the dependent variable, membership groups with no ESAA funding and NPOs with a large amount of nonmaterial resources were the most likely to score high on the group tactics index. When group tactics were considered as an independent variable, it was one of the most important predictors of group impact for both types of groups. In other words, groups willing to petition the school district to modify policies with which they disagreed, and groups that formed coalitions with similar organizations were more likely to bring about change than groups that remained reticent in the face of disagreement and chose not to increase their resource base through coalitions.

However, we should not conclude from this finding that only militant groups can be successful. We constructed the variable that measures group response to disagreement with LEA policy so as to include a wide range of potential responses. For that reason, this variable includes private discussions with LEA officials as well as speaking in public at school board meetings and, more militantly, filing suit against the district.

Consequently, some groups in our sample chose to register their protest by picketing the superintendent's office or by filing suit against the district. But the majority of the groups chose more traditional and moderate kinds of organized citizen action in their disagreements with the school district.

Perhaps most typical of these groups are the ten Leagues of Women Voters included in our sample. When these groups disagreed with district policies, their tactic was to gather factual information to substantiate their position, publicly testify before the school board, write letters to board members and the media, and finally, to lobby board members and LEA officials privately. Our fieldwork indicated that often the Leagues were successful in their endeavors and half of

those in our sample achieved a high impact (i.e., a score of 8 or more out of a possible 13 points) in terms of the changes they were able to effect.

Other groups, quite different from the Leagues in the composition of their membership and in their resource base, were also able to modify school district policies by their choice of tactics. For example, one neighborhood group we visited disagreed with the way the school district allocated its ESEA Title I and ESAA funds. Although the group had no budget or paid staff, its members became familiar with federal program regulations and visited schools regularly to see how these funds were being spent at the school-site. When the group found what it considered to be an improper or ineffective use of funds, it testified before the school board and lobbied the district administration until the problem was corrected. Although the group has not always been successful, its impact on school district operations has been much greater than one would expect, given its size and resource base. In other words, the effective use of group tactics does not necessarily mean that a group is in militant opposition to the school district. Rather, our fieldwork indicated that the most successful community groups were ones that carefully and continuously monitored district policies. In instances when they viewed these policies as unresponsive to community interests, these groups publicly, but judiciously, mounted arguments against the district's position.

A high score on the group tactics index was a significant predictor of group impact, and most NPOs did not score high on that index. NPOs were much less likely than other groups to protest school district policies or to form coalitions with other organizations. Groups willing to seek and receive funds from the federal government and to seemingly cooperate with the school district tend not to promote organized citizen action. Many non-ESAA-funded groups told us that they did not seek NPO funds because they believed these funds would affect other group activities. Receipt of NPO funds would bring their (previously unfunded) group under the provisions of the Hatch Act, which constrains the political activity of groups whose efforts are financed in whole or in part by grants made by the federal

government.[1] These groups felt that NPO funds would be a net loss: they could not use NPO funds to engage in "political" activities, and the receipt of these funds might constrain other, non-ESAA-funded group activities and goals. NPOs generally shared these views. They felt that receipt of federal funds did limit their rights to engage in organized citizen action.

Delivery of Educational Services

When the delivery of educational services was considered as an independent variable, we found that it had no significant effect on the impact of either NPOs or non-ESAA-funded groups.

The primary reason why the delivery of educational services was not a significant predictor of high group impact stems from the kind of limited change such activities produce. Groups that deliver educational services are much less likely to bring about permanent institutional change than groups that engage in advocacy or desegregation-specific activities. Of those groups delivering educational services, only 7.8 percent were able to bring about a permanent institutionalized change (Table 19). Such a change usually meant that the school district was willing to adopt the program run by the community organization, so that a tutoring component, drop-out program, or multicultural activity would then become part of the regular services provided by the school district. In contrast, almost a quarter of those groups engaging in advocacy or desegregation-specific activities were able to institutionalize the changes they effected.

Groups that deliver educational services are unlikely to facilitate desegregation. Any impact they might have is related more to a reduction in the effects of minority isolation. Most of the educational services provided by the groups in our sample were remedial in nature and were intended to compensate for the lack of educational opportunity afforded minority students. As Table 20 indicates, only

[1] Title 18--Crimes and Criminal Procedure, Sec. 595 Interference by Administrative Employees of Federal, State, or Territorial Governments.

Table 19

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GROUP'S ACTIVITY CHOICE AND STAGE OF CHANGE EFFECTED BY GROUP

Stage of Change Effected	Group Delivers Educational Services	Group Engages in Advocacy-Type Activities	Group Engages in Desegregation-Specific Activities
Community and/or decisionmakers aware of issues	10.9	24.1	34.8
In process of transitory change	60.9	46.6	30.4
Relatively permanent change in achievement or attitudes	20.3	6.9	8.7
Fully implemented change	7.8	22.4	26.1
	99.9	100.0	100.0
	(64)	(58)	(23)[a]

[a]The total number of activity choices is greater than the 131 groups in our sample because some group activities have more than one purpose.

Table 20

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACTIVITY CHOICE AND EXTENT TO WHICH GROUP IMPACT IS RELATED TO DESEGREGATION

Extent of Impact	Group Delivers Educational Services	Group Engages in Advocacy-Type Activities	Group Engages in Desegregation-Specific Activities
Impact had no effect on desegregation or the reduction of minority isolation	40.6	40.0	29.2
Impact reduced the effects of minority isolation	26.6	16.7	4.2
Impact facilitated desegregation	32.8	43.3	66.7
	100.0	100.0	100.1
	(64)	(60)	(24)[a]

[a]The total number of activity choices is greater than the 131 groups in our sample because some group activities have more than one purpose.

a third of the groups delivering educational services actually facilitated the desegregation process. This compares with 43.3 percent for groups engaged in advocacy-type activities and two-thirds for groups engaged in desegregation-specific activities.

Throughout our fieldwork, we often observed these fundamental differences between groups that delivered educational services and groups in the same community that engaged in other types of activities. The groups delivering educational services concentrated on helping individual students, particularly the victims of racial isolation. The other groups, rather than delivering needed services themselves, would attempt to get the school district or other official institutions to provide the service.

For example, in a small midwestern city we visited, one group (an ESAA-funded NPO) provided classroom volunteers to help students who needed additional assistance. The school district could not afford to employ either a volunteer coordinator or classroom aides. Consequently, the group was supplying a necessary service that the district could not provide. Unfortunately, this service was only provided to five of the district's thirty-six schools.

In contrast to this group and its service-oriented, individual-level approach was the work of the local NAACP chapter. This organization decided that one of the best ways to facilitate desegregation and overcome the effects of racial isolation for both black and white students would be for the district to establish a school-community relations department to provide human relations training for students and teachers to deal with problems between individual schools and the community. The NAACP lobbied the LEA and was successful in getting a school-community relations department established. In spite of severe budgetary cutbacks, the LEA now conducts human relations workshops in every district school. So rather than providing the necessary service itself, the NAACP persuaded the district to provide it on a far broader basis than the community group, with its limited resources, could ever do.

Although the delivery of educational services is unlikely to produce a high group impact, it is nonetheless the overwhelming choice of ESAA-NPOs. Why do these organizations select this activity and thus limit themselves to producing only a small to moderate impact?

Two factors promote the choice of educational activities among NPOs. Probably the most important factor is the ESAA program regulation requiring the LEA to review a group's NPO proposal. Although the approval of the LEA is not in fact required for funding, most groups--funded and not--believed that LEA "sign off" was necessary for funding. The effect of this belief was clear--some groups chose not to tailor their activities to gain LEA approval and did not apply. Those that did either already engaged in "acceptable" organizational activities or proposed "acceptable" activities to meet what they believed to be ESAA-NPO funding requirements.

A second factor that tends to promote the selection of educational activities among NPOs is the widespread belief that in order to qualify for ESAA funds, a group must mount a "program"--that is, deliver services. Although the program regulations do not proscribe other activities, nearly all of the authorized activities do specify either *programs*, *projects*, or *services*. Only Part D allows for "community activities, including public information and parental involvement efforts...."[1] Many groups believed that information dissemination, studies of school system performance, or lobbying efforts of various kinds which they were already engaged in or intended to pursue were not "programs" and therefore would not be funded by the HEW regional office. Consequently, most NPOs perceived ESAA program regulations as limiting their activity choices primarily to the delivery of educational services.

Advocacy-Type Activities

When a group's choice of advocacy-type activities was considered as an independent variable we found that it was the single best predictor of high group impact for both NPOs and non-ESAA funded groups.

---

[1]ESAA Regulations, 185.62d.

The groups most likely to be successful chose the following kinds of activities:

- o Information dissemination.
- o Efforts to improve school-community relations.
- o Attempts to increase community inputs into school decisionmaking.
- o Efforts to influence site selection or school closings.
- o Work on behalf of minority staff hiring and promotion.

These groups had more impact because they chose activities which if successful, could bring about institutionalized change and could spread beyond the normally limited purview of a community group. Even those groups that disseminated information--sometimes considered a service activity--usually did it as a first step in involving the community in school district operations, and--in the case of desegregation--as a means of building support for the plan. A group's choice of advocacy-type activities, then, was the single best predictor of group impact for two reasons. First, because these activities were aimed at policy changes, a successful outcome was likely to be institutionalized. Second, a successful outcome was also likely to benefit more people than could be served by a community group.

Even though the choice of advocacy activities is actually a better predictor for ESAA-NPOs than it is for non-ESAA funded groups, NPOs that chose such activities were clearly deviant cases. Less than one third of the NPOs in our sample engaged in advocacy activities as compared with approximately two-thirds of all non-NPOs. Most community groups with any interest in sponsoring advocacy activities felt constrained by the ESAA program mandates, particularly the required school district review of the NPO application. In some of our fieldwork sites, this perceived veto power had already been exercised by the school district and was therefore a real threat to any organization opposing LEA policy.

For example, in one small Southern city we visited, a community group had to sacrifice ESAA funding because of its choice of organizational activities. The majority of its budget comes from Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) funds, and the group's primary activity is providing various types of job training for high school dropouts. However, this organization, run by a strong and charismatic director who is judged by many to be the community's most important black leader, has chosen to use its nonmaterial resources and go beyond its educational service activities. It is very visible in the area, receiving frequent press coverage.

The school district in which the organization is located underwent court-ordered desegregation more than five years ago. Previously all-black schools were closed, and the burden of busing fell predominately on blacks (85 percent of the blacks in the LEA are bused as opposed to only 35 percent of the white students). Many problems such as a disproportionate number of suspensions and expulsions of black students and an increased black dropout rate have followed desegregation. The school district has traditionally been closed to community input.

The community organization lobbied both the school district and the city council (which appoints school board members) because students were being suspended and expelled without due process--sometimes even without completion of the requisite forms. When the school district continued to be unresponsive, the organization joined as a participant in a lawsuit against the district. As a result, the school district has begun to complete the requisite paperwork before it suspends a student. In addition, because of the group's work, the suspension rate in the district has decreased and both principals and parents call on the group when there is a problem regarding school suspensions. It has been able to change school district policies and make the LEA more responsive, particularly to the needs of blacks and poor white students. What this organization has done stands in sharp contrast to the other community group in this city. The other group, an ESAA-funded NPO, has chosen to compensate for the school district's

shortcomings by providing remedial education services, rather than by persuading the district to provide the needed services.

The penalty the more activist group has had to pay for its advocacy-type activities is the school district's refusal to sign off on its application when the group decided to apply for ESAA-NPO funds.[1] Still, the organization has been able to retain its CETA funding and plans to continue to engage in advocacy-type activities when necessary.

Even the NPOs that do choose to engage in advocacy activities still perceive some very real constraints on their operational flexibility. For example, one NPO in a currently desegregating district we visited is involved in information dissemination and in the establishment of parent cluster councils, which are aimed at increasing the community role in school decisionmaking and building support for the desegregation plan. But these activities are a second-best option for the organization. Its members feel that the most effective use of their time would be in lobbying civic and school district officials for stricter implementation of the plan (e.g., by pressuring the district to spend less of its resources on legal fees to appeal the desegregation order) and in monitoring the district's efforts. However, the organization feels that such activities are proscribed by virtue of its ESAA funding, and its need for resources has forced the group to select less preferable activities.

In sum, our fieldwork observations indicated that the vast majority of ESAA-funded NPOs perceive themselves as more constrained than do groups that receive funds from other governmental sources. Consequently, NPOs rarely choose advocacy or desegregation-specific activities. Instead, they opt overwhelmingly for less controversial,

---

[1] Although LEA refusal to sign off does not mean a group cannot receive ESAA-NPO funds, in most cases groups regard the LEA as having veto power. In this instance, the group did not apply for ESAA-NPO funds when the district refused to approve their application.

client-service activities which guarantee them a low to moderate impact but preclude them from effecting any lasting or broad-based change.

Desegregation-Specific Activities

When we considered choice of desegregation-specific activities as an independent variable, we found that it had no significant effect on group impact. So few NPOs (N=2) engaged in desegregation-specific activities we could not really test its effect on group impact.

For non-NPOs the lack of a significant effect stemmed from substantive factors. Desegregation activities are less likely to have an impact because they are high-risk; they often involve a large expenditure of effort with only a small probability of success. Comparing the groups in our sample we found that 93 percent of those delivering educational services and 87 percent of those engaging in advocacy-type activities produced at least some impact in terms of the changes they were able to effect. On the other hand, only 68 percent of those groups engaging in desegregation-specific activities had any impact at all.

Typical of such groups were ones that participated in filing a desegregation suit or that lobbied the school board to broaden the desegregation plan. Often they met with no success, even after years of effort. However, the groups that were successful brought about significant change in the district. In fact, sixteen of the twenty-three groups (70 percent) that engaged in desegregation-specific activities and brought about some change achieved a high impact (i.e., a score of 8 or more out of a possible 13 points). These groups were able to influence, among other things, the extent of desegregation and the criteria for student reassignment. As a result, changes produced by desegregation-specific activities had a positive and significant effect on desegregation.

Perhaps the best example was the work of an elite civic group in a southern city we visited. The judge hearing the desegregation case asked the group to assist in devising a student reassignment

plan. The group convened a task force representative of the leadership of the anglo, black, and hispanic communities in the city. The group determined the substance of the student desegregation plan and persuaded the judge to order that administrative staffing patterns within the school district be made more representative of the racial composition of the community.

Desegregation-specific activities, then, are risky--and they often fail. But when they succeed, their impact on district desegregation policy is unmistakable.

SUMMARY

In examining the effect of organizational resources and strategies on group impact, we found that the most important predictors of high group impact were the same for both NPOs and their non-ESAA-funded counterparts. In other words, successful NPOs did not differ significantly from successful groups not receiving ESAA funding. They both took public stands against school district policies with which they disagreed, coalesced with other organizations, and chose advocacy-type activities. If the formula for success is the same for both types of groups, the interesting question then is why so few NPOs choose this strategy.

Part of the reason is that most NPOs do not possess the resources needed to pursue such a strategy. They tend to be nonmembership groups with little visibility and no constituent base in their own communities. Consequently, even if NPOs were to select an activist strategy, many would find it difficult to pursue, given their lack of nonmaterial resources. In addition, most NPOs perceive themselves as constrained from selecting advocacy activities because of ESAA program regulations. They are reluctant to engage in any activities that are viewed as either militant or controversial for fear of losing their funding or incurring the wrath of local school district officials who must review their NPO applications. Consequently, the vast majority of ESAA-NPOs choose to deliver educational services which have only a low to moderate impact on individual clients.

Section VI discusses the implications for the ESAA-NPO program, given this divergence between the determinants of high group impact and the strategies most often chosen by NPOs.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This study of 131 community organizations in forty school districts across the country shows that these groups can have a significant impact on school district policies and programs. Whether a group is able to have such an impact is dependent on its resource base and how well it is able to match its choice of activities and strategy with both the desegregation context of the school district and the type of resources the group has. The nature of this match between group resources and activity choice on the one hand, and desegregation context on the other is critical in assessing future directions for the ESAA-NPO program. This section discusses the policy implications for this program which emerge from our main findings.[1]

The first broad question this study addressed was

- What are the most important factors in predicting the impact a community organization will have on facilitating school desegregation?

We found that the most direct and significant determinant of high impact is not the community context in which a group operates, or even its level of resources; rather, it is a group's choice of tactics and activities. The single best predictor of group success for both NPOs and non-ESAA funded groups is their decision to engage in advocacy activities. Groups selecting this type of activity are the most likely to have a large impact because the changes they bring about usually affect a large number of people and are likely to be institutionalized. On the other hand, groups delivering educational services can usually expect to have a low to moderate impact. Their inability to reach more than a small clientele and their tendency to effect only transitory changes preclude such groups from producing a large

[1] The discussion in this chapter suggests general directions the program might take. Volume IV in this series outlines specific recommendations based on our research.

impact. Other factors with a positive and significant effect on group impact are the manner in which a group responds to disagreements with school district policy, and its willingness and ability to coalesce with organizations pursuing similar goals.

In other words, successful NPOs behave in much the same way as their successful non-ESAA-funded counterparts. Yet our analysis indicates that very few NPOs opt for the strategy most likely to achieve high group impact. They do not select advocacy activities or take public stands against school district policies with which they disagree. Instead, most NPOs choose to deliver educational services because they lack the nonmaterial resources needed to pursue other strategies and because they perceive ESAA program mandates as limiting their activity choices. An important policy issue, then, is how can the ESAA program be modified to encourage more NPOs to select those organizational strategies most likely to result in high group impact?

In Sec. I we posed a number of policy-related questions about determinants of group success which federal officials might consider in establishing award criteria for the ESAA-NPO program. Included were factors such as:

1. The size of school district enrollment.
2. Openness of the school district to community input.
3. The number and percent of minority student enrollment.
4. Recency of the desegregation plan.
5. Size of the community group's resource base.
6. The group's choice of activities.

We assumed that the first four factors would only have an indirect effect on group impact, which would be mediated through the group's resources and its choice of strategy. However, we found that neither the district's size nor its racial composition, nor even its openness

to community inputs affected the resource level or kinds of activities a group chose.[1]

The recency of a district's desegregation plan is important in that it positively predicts a group's choice of advocacy activities which, in turn, are the activities most likely to result in the highest group impact. In other words, awarding ESAA-NPO grants on the basis of district size, racial composition, or openness to community input will not result in the funding of any more effective groups than are presently funded. Awarding grants to groups operating in districts in the early stages of desegregation will only result in the funding of more effective groups if these groups choose to engage in advocacy activities such as information dissemination, efforts to increase community input into school district decisionmaking, and attempts to influence site selection or school closings. Recency of plan implementation does not of itself increase a group's chances of achieving a high impact.

In terms of the relationship between a community group's resource base and its ability to produce a high impact, we found that material resources had no significant effect on group impact.[2]

Consequently, of the half-dozen or so policy variables we listed in Sec. I as possible award criteria for the ESAA-NPO program,

---

[1]To determine whether there was even a simple relationship between any of these factors and group impact, we performed several cross-tabular analyses and found no significant relationship between group impact and any of these contextual factors.

[2]We also attempted to determine how ESAA-NPOs that received all of their material resources from the ESAA program compared with ones that received only a fraction of their budget from the program. Unfortunately, since so few of the ESAA-NPOs in our sample achieved a high impact, we could not adequately address this issue. We do know, however, that none of the twenty NPOs in our sample that received all of their budget from the ESAA program achieved anything but a moderate impact, and that the few ESAA-NPOs in the sample that produced a large impact all received only a portion of their total budget from the program.

only one--a group's decision to engage in advocacy activities--was a positive and significant determinant of high group impact.

The second question this study addressed was:

- How does the impact of groups funded under the ESAA-NPO program compare with that of non-ESAA-funded groups?

Our analysis indicates that ESAA-NPOs are by no means ineffective organizations. Over three-fourths of them had at least a moderate impact (scoring 4 to 7 points on a 13 point scale). Thirty percent of the NPOs in our sample were able to bring about changes facilitating desegregation and 33 percent reduced the effects of minority isolation.

Yet the fact remains that even though 25 percent of non-ESAA-funded groups had no impact (as compared with 15 percent of ESAA-funded groups), 38 percent of the non-ESAA-funded groups had a large impact (scoring 8 points or above on a 13 point scale). This figure compares with only 7 percent for ESAA-NPOs. In other words, successful non-ESAA-funded groups had much greater impact in their communities than did successful ESAA groups.

Given these findings, and assuming that federal policymakers wish to continue the ESAA-NPO program, what are the options available to them? One is to maintain the program in its present form; the other is to reorient it so that ESAA-funded groups will direct more of their efforts toward facilitating desegregation.

If the NPO program remains in its present form, it will continue to be a compensatory education program whose main purpose is to assist students who have not been afforded equal educational opportunity. Convincing arguments can be made that such a program is addressing an important educational need. Since many school districts are short of funds, some LEAs may be unable to provide adequate remedial services in the future. Our fieldwork observations also indicated that NPOs were often able to deliver educational services more efficiently than local school districts. Because the professionals employed by NPOs were not subject to collective bargaining contracts, their salaries were lower and they were often willing to work longer hours than many

classroom teachers. In some school districts we visited, NPOs were able to attract volunteers more successfully than the school district. Also, NPO directors often worked directly with students, thus reducing administrative costs. Consequently, NPOs can often be expected to deliver more services to students per dollar than can local school districts.[1] In some communities we visited, NPOs also had better access to students and their parents. The NPOs were not seen as part of the official school system and NPO staff were willing to make home visits--something school district personnel often did not do. Hence an argument can be made that NPOs usually provide a needed service efficiently and assist students who have been victims of racial isolation.

Clearly, the evidence presented in Vols. I and II of this study indicates that over time the focus of the NPO program shifted away from activities that actually facilitated desegregation to ones that provided educational services to disadvantaged students. Because of the type of activities authorized by program regulations and because of the requirement for LEA review of funding applications, the vast majority of ESAA-NPOs are funded to deliver educational services rather than to engage in advocacy or desegregation activities. Consequently, it is not surprising that we found the overwhelming majority of ESAA-NPOs delivering educational services.

Still, the fact remains that the ESAA-NPO program was conceived to be more than a source of compensatory education funding for community groups, and in the view of many federal officials, this intent persists in spite of increased funding of compensatory projects. Its primary purpose was to fund the community organizations that could assist school districts in facilitating desegregation. This purpose would seem to imply that the program ought to be reoriented and different types of activities encouraged. Given the history of the ESAA-NPO program and its predecessor, the Community Groups program, it is unlikely that federal policymakers would consider it politically feasible

[1] Some people have argued, however, that this cost effectiveness may only be temporary and that as NPOs age, they will become more like school districts--highly bureaucratized with a larger ratio of paid to unpaid staff.

to fund community groups that are pressing desegregation suits against local school districts.[1] But a number of other activities would seem acceptable for ESAA funding.

Perhaps the best way to consider what these activities are is to think about how community groups can best address the needs of a desegregating district. Among a school district's greatest needs (i.e., the ones that can be dealt with by community groups) are (1) providing the community with information on the desegregation plan and (2) building broad-based support for the plan as well as for public education in general. The first need can be addressed by disseminating information about both the logistics of the plan (who takes which bus to which school) and the substance of the plan (e.g., the kinds of schools students will be transferred to and the curricular offerings at those schools). The staffing of rumor control networks is also appropriate for this need.

One of the most effective information dissemination projects we saw was run by a League of Women Voters. During the summer prior to desegregation, the League sponsored an "Information Saturday" at all the major shopping centers in the city to inform parents and students about the desegregation plan and about the various types of magnet schools available. The League also obtained public service spots on local radio stations so that information could be broadcast in both English and Spanish. The project was run completely with volunteer labor so that only a small amount of money was needed for printing materials. Such an activity could be a prime target for ESAA-NPO funding.

Myriad community group activities address the school district's second need--to build and maintain support for the desegregation plan. A crucial first activity is community groups' assistance to the court and the school district when the desegregation plan is being devised. Usually some schools are already naturally integrated. However, the school district, in attempting to achieve a district-wide racial balance, will often neglect to treat them differently from racially

---

[1] See Vol. I of this series for a discussion of the ESAP Community Groups program and the opposition to its advocacy focus.

isolated ones. In these instances, neighborhood groups can be instrumental in helping the school district avoid mistakes which would upset existing patterns of acceptable racial balance. Community groups can also assist school districts in making decisions about where to locate magnet schools and what kinds of programs to offer in order to attract needed students. While these activities do not necessarily require funding, it would seem important to encourage groups receiving ESAA funding to engage in such efforts in addition to their funded projects. Many ESAA-funded groups now avoid such activity because they believe it would compromise their funding. On the other hand, non-ESAA groups are often dissuaded from applying for NPO funding because they believe they could then no longer engage in such organized citizen action.

One of the most important ways to build support for the plan is to get parents involved in the schools. Parental involvement is more difficult to encourage during desegregation because parents must be convinced to participate in activities outside their own neighborhood and with people of different races. Consequently, the efforts of community groups to encourage increased parental participation are crucial. These efforts can help guarantee that parent organizations at each school represent the entire composition of the student body. Such activities can also assist in stemming flight from the public schools, on the assumption that parents' first-hand experience with their children's new school will allay most of their fears and opposition.

But parental involvement is a two-way street. If parents support the schools, they expect the schools to be responsive to their needs and concerns in return. Therefore, community groups can assist parents by disseminating information on school policies and procedures, by providing them with sufficient expertise to monitor school operations, and by helping parents to acquire the skills needed to increase community input into school district decisionmaking. Our research indicates that where parents and community groups were able to participate in school and district decisions, they were much more likely to support both public education and desegregation. Hence parent training is another area where community groups can play an important role.

As these examples indicate, desegregating school districts have several critical needs which community groups can address. Consequently, it would seem that if ESAA-funded groups are to be more directly involved with facilitating desegregation, these would be appropriate activity choices for them. These activities are more likely to affect desegregation and are most likely to produce the largest overall impact.

In addition to encouraging different types of activities, federal policymakers could also change the direction of the NPO program by funding different types of organizations than are presently funded. NPOs tend to be newer, nonmembership groups with few nonmaterial resources such as community visibility and independent leader influence. Hence they usually lack a base in the community. Often, however, the groups most likely to have a large impact are well-established membership organizations. They tend to be highly visible and can speak for a definite constituency. Although some of these groups avoid federal funding because of its perceived constraints, there are others that would be prime candidates for ESAA funding. Obviously, it could be difficult, but far from impossible, to identify these groups and encourage them to apply. The search procedures used in this study could be replicated by USOE personnel. In currently desegregating districts where the need for effective groups is greatest, USOE staff could identify appropriate groups through a few telephone calls to knowledgeable informants (e.g., the education reporter, a representative of the NAACP, the chair of the education committee of the League of Women Voters, etc.).

There would be obvious tradeoffs in changing the NPO program's orientation. Moving away from the delivery of educational services means that NPOs would engage in higher risk activities. Because activities such as influencing the content of the desegregation plan or building support for it are less likely to succeed, NPOs would no longer be guaranteed their almost certain low to moderate impacts. In addition, if more autonomous groups with their own base in the community were funded, they would be less likely to be in complete agreement with the school district. These groups, much more than presently

funded NPOs, would be willing to take an independent and public stand in the event of disagreement with the LEA. Such a situation would alter the fairly passive and dependent relationship most NPOs now have with their local school district.

In spite of these problems, our research indicates that such a reorientation could mean that successful NPOs would be more likely to have a large impact. The changes they caused would more often be institutionalized and would have an effect well beyond the group's immediate constituency. Finally, and most importantly, it would mean that ESAA-funded NPOs would be more actively involved in facilitating desegregation than they are now.

Appendix A

SAMPLE SELECTION AND FIELDWORK PROCEDURES

SAMPLE DESIGN

Site investigations were conducted at a sample of 146 community organizations selected in two stages. The first stage was an equal probability sample of 40 LEAs selected from among the 136 LEAs served by currently funded NPOs.[1] This sampling was stratified first according to desegregation status, then with nested stratification by geographic region, degree of urbanness, and number of NPOs per LEA.

Community organizations that engaged in desegregation or minority isolation-related activities in the selected LEAs were identified by means of a telephone nomination procedure. The identified organizations (NPOs and non-NPOs alike) were ranked according to an index of centrality, then systematic samples of up to four organizations were selected from each LEA. There was also an "auxiliary" sampling of 40 additional NPOs selected according to criteria that varied from LEA to LEA.

Selection of LEAs

Restriction of Target Population. In order to better focus research resources, the target population was reduced from the 136 LEAs that were served by NPOs. First, LEAs where black students constituted less than 15 percent of the LEA enrollment were eliminated because of the client's desire to concentrate resources on black-white desegregation; this reduced the target population by 23 LEAs. Second, LEAs in communities with less than 10,000 population were eliminated because communities of that size are unlikely to have any community organizations performing the types of activities that were the focus of the study; 24 communities were in this size range, but since there is overlap between small communities and LEAs with few black students,

[1] One currently desegregating district was included in the sample although it was not served by NPOs.

eliminating communities with small populations reduced the target population by only an additional 16 LEAs. Finally, one LEA was set aside for pretesting and training fieldworkers. Thus the remaining target population consisted of 96 LEAs.

Selection of Stratifying Variables. The primary goal of stratification was to guarantee inclusion of certain types of LEAs for analytic purposes. In particular, we made an early decision to sample all 15 currently desegregating LEAs in the target population.[1] This, in effect, meant stratifying at two levels according to whether desegregation was current, then selecting each LEA in the currently desegregating stratum with certainty. The remaining 25 sample selections allocated to the other stratum were to be highly stratified in order to maximize their general representativeness. There was an a priori preference for using geographic region and degree of urbanness as stratifiers, since these variables "explain" much of inter-LEA differences with respect to character of desegregation. After examining some of the characteristics of NPOs and the LEAs they serve, it was decided to adopt number of NPOs per district as a third stratifier to guarantee the inclusion of multi-NPO LEAs, since over two-thirds of the LEAs are served by only one NPO.

Seven levels were adopted for the geographic region stratification:

1. Northeast (New England)--Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut.
2. Mideast--New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia.
3. South--the Old Confederacy, plus Kentucky, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas.
4. Great Lakes--Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota.
5. Farm states--Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, the Dakotas.
6. Mountain states--Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico.
7. West coast--Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Hawaii.

---

[1] Except for one, which was reserved for fieldwork training as noted above.

The intent with the urbanness stratifier was to capture something of the urban quality of a community as well as its size; thus the four levels are not mutually exclusive with respect to size:

1. Communities exceeding 250,000 population.
2. Communities that are suburbs or satellites of those in level 1.
3. Nonsuburbs between 50,000 and 250,000 population.
4. Nonsuburbs between 10,000 and 50,000 population.

The population size breaks are the same as those commonly used by the Bureau of the Census.

For the NPOs-per-LEA stratifier, three levels were used:

1. LEAs served by one NPO.
2. LEAs served by two NPOs.
3. LEAs served by three or more NPOs.

Sampling Frame. The sampling frame for the selection of LEAs that are not currently desegregating might best be visualized as a three-dimensioned 6 x 4 x 3 matrix; six *rows* for the geographic regions, four *columns* for the degree-of-urbanness strata, and three *files* for the NPOs-per-LEA strata. An exploded version of this matrix is depicted in Fig. A.1; the three files are shown as separate two-dimensioned submatrices, one for each of the NPOs-per-LEA strata. Six rows for geographic strata and four columns for degree-of-urbanness strata are in each submatrix. Note that all three first rows collectively comprise the first geographic stratum; all three first columns collectively comprise the first degree-of-urbanness stratum, etc. There are two numbers in each cell: one indicates the number of LEAs belonging to that cell; the number in parentheses is the aggregate probability for LEAs in that cell (the probability for each LEA is equal to 81 divided by 25, or .309). Since the aggregate probability often exceeds one (1.0), it will be called the cell "quota" rather than cell probability. Some cell quotas have been rounded

File 1:

–	–	3 (.93)	–
2 (.62)	6 (1.85)	1 (.30)	2 (.63)
1 (.30)	6 (1.85)	11 (3.40)	7 (2.15)
3 (.93)	5 (1.55)	3 (.93)	–
1 (.31)	1 (.30)	1 (.31)	–
2 (.63)	–	1 (.30)	–

File 2:

–	–	–	–
1 (.31)	–	–	–
5 (1.55)	1 (.30)	3 (.93)	–
–	–	–	–
1 (.30)	–	–	–
–	2 (.62)	1 (.31)	–

File 3:

–	–	–	–
1 (.30)	–	–	–
4 (1.23)	1 (.31)	1 (.31)	–
1 (.30)	–	–	–
–	–	–	–
1 (.31)	2 (.63)	–	–

NOTE: In each cell, the respective number of LEAs is indicated. The number in parentheses is the cell quota. The total LEAs across the frame is 81. The sum of the cell quotas is equal to 25.00.

Row Quotas (Regional Strata)	
1. . . .	.93
2. . . .	4.01
3. . . .	12.33
4. . . .	3.71
5. . . .	1.22
6. . . .	2.80
	25.00

Column Quotas (Urbanness Strata)	
1. . . .	7.09
2. . . .	7.42
3. . . .	7.71
4. . . .	2.78
	25.00

File Quotas (NPOs-per LEA Strata)	
1. . . .	17.29
2. . . .	4.32
3. . . .	3.39
	25.00

Fig. A.1--Sampling Frame for Not-Currently-Desegregating LEAs

upward and others rounded downward in order to make their sum over the matrix total to 25.00. Quotas have also been calculated for rows, columns, and files; these quotas are shown below the matrices.

The integer and fractional parts of the quotas contain useful information for describing sample allocation. For example, the quota for the first column in the frame (see File 2) is 7.09; to allocate the sample proportionally to stratum size, we had to make *at least* seven selections from that column, and there was a probability of .09 that an eighth selection would be made. Similarly, the quota for the first row is .93, meaning that there was a chance for no selection from that row, but a .93 probability that one selection would be made. If the sample design also provides for proportional allocation among cells,[1] then in like fashion the integer part of each cell quota indicates how many certainty selections would be made from the respective cell, and the fractional part indicates the probability with which an additional selection would be made.

SAMPLE SELECTION METHOD

Few options were available for the sample selection method because of constraints imposed by the sampling frame and the desired sample characteristics:

1. NPOs could be distributed very unevenly across the frame.
2. Cell sizes were small, and sometimes nonexistent.
3. It was desired that LEAs be selected with equal probabilities.
4. It was desired that the sample be allocated proportionally among all three kinds of strata simultaneously.

If it were the case that LEAs were uniformly distributed across the frame, cells could have been selected with equal probability lattice sampling, and then one LEA could have been selected in each selected cell. If the cell quotas were all integer values, then corresponding numbers of LEAs could have been randomly selected within each cell.

[1]The sample selection technique that was used to select LEAs in fact had this property and will be described on a subsequent page.

If we had not required equal probability sampling, we could have collapsed some of the occupied cells so that their number totaled 25, then randomly selected one LEA from each. If we had not required that the sample be proportionally allocated among all strata, a number of reasonable options could have been available, such as one-way stratification, systematic sampling of LEAs ordered according to cell placement, simple random sampling of LEAs, etc.

The method that satisfied the four constraints, and which was actually used, was to make 25 cell selections[1] with probabilities proportional to size (i.e., proportional to cell quota) using probability lattice sampling, and then to select one LEA in each selected cell with equal probabilities. Probability lattice sampling was introduced by Jessen[2] and can be characterized as combining the "controlled sampling" approach of Goodman and Kish[3] with the more rigid stratification control found in lattice sampling. Basically the technique requires the sampler to (1) arbitrarily designate a set of potential samples, each of which contains 25 cell selections and satisfies the proportional-allocation-to-strata constraint; (2) assign selection probabilities to each of the potential samples; then (3) select one of the samples, observing the assigned selection probabilities. The designation of potential samples and the assignment of selection probabilities is done according to an algorithm that assures (1) that the sum of selection probabilities over the entire set is exactly 1.0; (2) that the *expected* numbers of selection for each cell, row, column, and file are exactly equal to their respective quotas; and (3) that the *actual* numbers of selections for each cell,

---

[1] Twenty-one distinct cells were actually chosen, since some were selected more than once.

[2] R. J. Jessen, "Probability Sampling with Marginal Restraints," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 65, 1970, pp. 776-796.

[3] R. Goodman and L. Kish, "Controlled Selection--a Technique in Probability Sampling," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 45, 1950, pp. 350-372.

row, column, and file are exactly equal to either the integer portions of their respective quotas or the integer portions plus one (1.0).[1]

SELECTION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

Once the 40 LEAs were chosen, the sampling of community organizations proceeded in two phases. In the first phase, community informants (nominators) were asked to nominate organizations that engaged in activities related to desegregation in the selected LEAs.[2] During these conversations interviewers administered the centrality index, which was designed to obtain a measure of how central each organization was to the desegregation process in that specific school district. In the second phase, nominated organizations from each LEA (NPOs and non-NPOs alike) were listed according to their centrality rankings. Four organizations were selected from each LEA list, using systematic random sampling.

These procedures were designed to secure representation of a range of organization centrality from each community, but they did not guarantee that NPOs would be selected for each LEA[3] and consequently did not guarantee that there would be a sufficient overall sample of NPOs to allow credible contrasts between NPOs and non-NPOs. For this reason, an auxiliary sample of forty additional NPOs was selected. At least one NPO was selected for each LEA where the systematic sampling failed to produce any. The remainder of the forty were allocated in proportion to the number of unselected NPOs in each LEA. The regional distribution of districts and community groups included in the study is shown in Table A.1.

---

[1] Jessen, R. J., "Some Properties of Probability Lattice Sampling," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, Vol. 68, 1973, pp. 20-28.

[2] The specific types of nominators are described in the next subsection.

[3] Considerable thought was given to devising a sampling scheme that would control for NPOs as well as centrality, but because of the sparseness of NPOs, any solution would have unduly complicated the weighing problems.

Table A.1

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS
AND COMMUNITY GROUPS

Region	School Districts[a]		Community Groups	
Northeast	22.5%	(9)	22%	(29)
North Central	27.5%	(11)	28%	(37)
South	40%	(16)	40%	(52)
West	10%	(4)	10%	(13)
Total	100%	40	100%	131

[a]Our universe included all school districts with ESAA-funded NPOs. Consequently, Southern school districts are disproportionately represented in this sample because more projects are funded in this region than in other areas of the country.

FIELDWORK PROCEDURES

Interviews were conducted in a multistratified probabilistic sample of 40 school districts which, with one exception, housed at least one NPO. The purposes were (1) to obtain evaluation data on a systematic random sample of organizations funded and not funded under the ESAA-NPO program and (2) to obtain data about the context in which these organizations worked.

Beginning January 1977, telephone contacts were made in all districts selected for on-site visits. Notification letters were sent to the district, NPOs and chief state school officers informing them of our pending activity. The purpose of the phone calls was to obtain background information for interviewers, to develop a complete list of organizations pursuing activities related to desegregation or minority isolation from which a sample could be drawn, and to make appointments for on-site interviews. Letters of confirmation were sent verifying interview schedules.

Packets of materials were assembled for the interviewers in preparation for site visits. These contained:

- Fact sheets about the school district (demographic statistics, desegregation status, etc.).

- Master appointment list for each site.
- Newspaper articles appearing in *N. Y. Times* or Newsbank (a microfiche collection of local newspapers).
- Map of the site vicinity.
- Summary of centrality information.
- Copies of confirmation letters.
- Summary of NPO proposals.
- Summary of ESAA regulations.
- Field instruments and training materials.

Training of the fieldwork staff occurred one week before fieldwork began. The training sessions lasted a full week. During that time interviewers became informed about the purposes of the NPO project, and typical interview situations and debriefing sessions were simulated. Practice interviews were conducted in a local school district. A day-long session was held afterward to polish interviewing techniques, answer questions, and discuss experiences.

DATA COLLECTION

Each district was visited by a two-person team for about one week. At each site, approximately twenty interviews were conducted. While this number varied considerably from one district to another depending on district size and number of community groups, these appointments were distributed as follows for each of our major respondent types:

- 4-5 nominators.
- 2-3 leaders and staff members of each sampled organization.
- 2 targets for each of two organization activities.

Respondent Types

Three classes of respondents were interviewed--nominators, organization people, and targets.

Nominators. These are people whom we have found to be generally knowledgeable about the district context, the schools, and desegregation. In each district, we contacted a newspaper reporter who

handles education matters; the chairman of the education subcommittee of the League of Women Voters; a black leader, usually the head of the NAACP; and someone in the LEA who works with community groups, e.g., an assistant superintendent for community relations. In most cases, the telephone interviewer spoke to more than four nominators, but limited appointments to those who were best informed and provided a range of perspectives.

Organization People. Interviews were conducted with the head of each group in the sample and, if such people existed, with the persons who were responsible for the two group activities most related to desegregation or minority isolation.

Targets. For each organization visited, up to four targets were interviewed. Targets are people who are in a position to know whether and how well a group has met its goals. In identifying targets, we tried to avoid people who were directly involved in group activities, e.g., a teacher who attended inservice training conducted by a group. Rather, we tried to find people who knew of but were not directly involved with the group; in the case above, the principal whose teachers attend training sessions. In cases where objective observers were lacking, targets were identified as people who received services or were the object of group lobbying efforts but who could be expected to have a somewhat broader perspective, e.g., a parent who is also a Parent Advisory Council member. In selecting two targets for each activity, we tried to balance their perspectives as much as possible. In most cases, one target represented the establishment (usually the schools) and the second was a grass roots person.

Selection of Activities

For each organization visited we examined up to two school desegregation or minority-isolation activities.[1] The activities were ones

[1]The decision to evaluate only two activites did not mean that the significance of other activities was ignored. However, relevant targets and organization persons were interviewed about the *impact* of only the two dominant activities. We obtained information related to the mix of activities in an organization, and the relationship between that mix and the impact of a selected activity. We did not, however, evaluate all activities of an organization.

that used the bulk of the organization's resources. In the event that no activities were dominant in terms of resources, the activities selected were those most directly related to the organization's stated goals.

DATA PRESENTATION

Interviewers were responsible for producing two sets of materials for each site: (1) a set of field notes and (2) a case study writeup and checklist. The field notes summarized and synthesized individual interviews with respondents. The case study summarized the information from a number of respondents in terms of selected concepts. Case study writeups were guided by a specific outline reflecting major hypotheses in order to assure completeness and comparability of information across sites.

Appendix B

CASE STUDY METHOD AND CODING INSTRUMENTS

The case survey method was originally designed as a means of performing secondary data analysis on existing case studies. A closed-ended form is used to obtain similar information from each of the selected cases. Intercoder reliability is established by having a subsample of cases coded by more than one reader. With this method, the qualitative and descriptive data found in case studies are translated into a form that can be used in quantitative analysis.

Because of the number of community groups and sites included in our sample, we were faced with the choice of either using closed-ended survey questionnaires in the field or finding a way to aggregate open-ended interviews systematically. We rejected the first option because it would have precluded interviewers from following new leads while in the field, and it would have prematurely standardized information and made us less sensitive to the uniqueness of individual sites.

Consequently, we decided to pursue traditional case study methods while in the field and used an open-ended interview format. Field staff then wrote a case study on each site visited. These cases were based on a very detailed and comprehensive outline so as to maximize comparability across sites. Because of the tremendous amount of data contained in each case and the large number of cases, traditional case study analysis could not be used. Although to our knowledge the case survey method had never been used before on primary data, we decided it would be the best way to aggregate our case studies. Because we were working with data we collected ourselves, we would have much better quality control than studies using this method on secondary data. In addition, we would have fewer missing data problems, and the case studies would be written in such a way as to facilitate the extraction of codable data. Therefore, a closed-ended survey form was used for each community group, and data were extracted on its characteristics and the characteristics of the school district and community in which it operated. The analysis in

this study is based primarily on the quantitative data derived from the case survey forms, but throughout our research we have tried to be sensitive to unique conditions and events as reported in individual case studies. Our aim has been to integrate traditional case study analysis with the more quantitative case survey method.

Included in this appendix is a variable list from the case survey instrument we used.[1]

INTERCODER RELIABILITY

To test the reliability of data extracted from the individual case studies, twenty of the 131 cases (approximately 15 percent of the total sample) were coded by two different persons. On the school district coding form, the average amount of agreement between the two coders was 69 percent overall and 78 percent on those items actually used in the analysis.[2] There were 27 items that had an observed agreement of 50 percent or less; only 9 of these, however, were used in the data analysis. On the community group coding forms, the average amount of agreement among coders was 71 percent, both overall and for the items used in the analysis. Six items had an observed agreement of 50 percent or less, but only three of them were used in our analysis.

The percentage of agreement between coders may be considered quite high since most of the questions in the case survey forms involved multiple response categories. Therefore, the level of agreement expected from random guessing is well below 50 percent.

The measurement of group impact was a numerical score, and because this variable was central to our analysis we subjected it to a separate test of reliability. We found that for our twenty case subsample, in only one case was there a difference of more than one standard deviation in the impact as scored by two different coders.

---

[1]The complete instrument is available on request from The Rand Corporation.

[2]The observed agreement between two coders for each item in the case survey forms can be obtained from The Rand Corporation on request.

CASE SURVEY INSTRUMENT
DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

Community Context

- o Region
- o Population and distribution by race and age
- o Economic vitality of the area
  - total retail sales, 1976
  - overall unemployment and rate for blacks, March 1977
  - average manufacturing wage, 1970
  - quality of the downtown business area
  - quality of central city housing
  - socioeconomic status of central city residents
  - elite perception of and involvement with the economic development of the area
- o Types of community groups active in the area
- o Economic and political status of the black community
  - socioeconomic status of the black community
  - access of black groups to elected officials
  - number of blacks holding major elective and appointive offices
  - base of support for black candidates

School District Demographic Characteristics

- o Size and racial distribution of public school enrollment
- o Enrollment in public and parochial schools
- o Enrollment trends over the next few years
- o Potential for white flight
- o Total school district budget
- o Per pupil spending
- o Amount of funding from ESEA Title I, Title VII, and ESAA
- o District's overall financial condition

School District Organizational and Political Characteristics

- o Public perception of school district quality
- o Whether school board elected or appointed
- o Public support for the public schools
  - turnout for school board elections, if applicable
  - whether recent school bonds have been approved by the voters
  - level of public involvement with the schools
- o Elite support and involvement with the schools
- o How the school district deals with community input
- o The extent to which the district has introduced new educational approaches or practices
- o Extent of agreement among school board members on specific policy issues (e.g., desegregation, personnel policy, curriculum, etc.)
- o Relationship between the superintendent and school board
- o Quality of superintendent leadership
  - relationship with staff
  - visibility in the community
  - general competence

Desegregation Status of the School District

- o Major impetus for original plan
- o Year plan was (will be) first implemented
- o Major actors in designing the plan
- o Extent of plan implementation
- o Legal status of the desegregation case
- o Extent of resegregation since the plan was first implemented

Plan Characteristics

- o Percentage of students reassigned under mandatory aspects of the plan

- o Percentage of students who changed schools under voluntary aspects of the plan
- o Average length of individual student reassignment
- o Black participation in mandatory busing as compared with white participation

Community Stance Toward Desegregation

- o Whether desegregation is a major issue in the community
- o Influence of pro-desegregation groups (access to the media, extent of public support, etc.)
- o Influence of anti-desegregation groups
- o White elite and mass attitudes toward desegregation, including perceptions of its inevitability
- o Black elite and mass attitudes toward desegregation
- o Groups that support desegregation
- o Actions of mayor and school superintendent with regard to desegregation
- o Any activities to reduce white flight

CASE SURVEY INSTRUMENT
COMMUNITY GROUP CHARACTERISTICS

General Organizational Characteristics

- Group type (e.g., Urban League, League of Women Voters, NAACP, neighborhood group, civic or business elite group, etc.)
- Year group first established and whether it has been in continuous existence since then
- Group's current desegregation-related activities and whether they are group's main activity
- Past desegregation-related activities
- Group's current annual operating budget and funding sources
- Whether group receives ESAA-NPO funding and if not, why it has not applied for these funds
- Number of paid staff and staff experience
- Number of volunteers
- Number of members
- Socioeconomic status of leader/staff and members/clients
- Group track record and visibility
- Influence and competence of group leader
- Influence of group members
- Press coverage of group activities
- Who makes major decisions within the organization
- Group's reference public
- Group's relationship with the school district
  - what it does when it disagrees with district policies
  - whether the school district provides the group with any resources and if yes, what kind
- Political activity of the group
- Whether the group forms coalitions with similar organizations

Specific Information on Group Activities (These questions were repeated for the group's second activity, if applicable.)

- Description of the group's activity
- Purpose of the activity
- Why group selected this activity
- The percentage of group budget spent on activity
- The area served by and targets of the activity
- Who is involved in carrying out the activity
- How often activity is carried out
- Relationship of the activity to school district operations
- Whether activity would have been undertaken, if group had not chosen to do it

Impact Score (These questions were repeated for any additional changes and the group's second activity, if applicable.)

- Level and scope of change brought about by the group
- Stage of implementation of the change
- Relationship of the change to desegregation
- Whether group is considered wholly responsible for the change
- Overall impact score which sums across activities and changes

General Information on the Group's Impact

- Whether the impact of the group is what could be expected, given its resources and activity choice
- Respondent's perceptions of the group's effectiveness
- How NPOs in a given community compare with other groups on the risk-level of their activity choices, internal efficiency, and their impact on desegregation

Appendix C

DESCRIPTION OF CONTEXTUAL VARIABLES

Each of the single variables and indexes included in the analyses of the effect of context in Sec. IV are described in this appendix.

SOCIOECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COMMUNITY

Single Variables

- Quality of central city housing
  - 0 = Little or no residential housing in central city
  - 1 = Deteriorated with no efforts at renewal
  - 2 = Deteriorated but some efforts at renewal
  - 3 = Adequate without renewal effort needed or made
  - 4 = Good primarily because of renewal
- Quality of downtown business area
  - 0 = Deteriorating with no efforts at renewal
  - 1 = Deteriorating but some efforts at renewal
  - 2 = Stable without renewal effort needed or made
  - 3 = Revitalized primarily because of renewal
  - 4 = Revitalized primarily for other reasons
- Socioeconomic status of central city residents
  - 0 = Few or no central city residents
  - 1 = Exclusively low income
  - 2 = Predominantly low income, but some middle income residents
  - 3 = Predominantly low income, but some upper income residents
  - 4 = Representative of several income groups
- Business and civic elite perceive city to be
  - 1 = In decline
  - 2 = Stable
  - 3 = Economically vital and growing

- Elite perceptions of why they promote the city
  - 1 = Not active in promoting city
  - 2 = To forestall decline
  - 3 = To promote growth
- Area population
  - 1 = More than 500,000
  - 2 = 100,000-500,000
  - 3 = Less than 100,000
- Percentage of blacks in the population
  - 0 = 1-11%
  - 1 = 12-15%
  - 2 = 16-25%
  - 3 = 26-35%
- Region of the country
  - 0 = Non-South
  - 1 = South
- Political sophistication of black community
  - 1 = Politically unsophisticated
  - 4 = Politically sophisticated
- White support for black candidates
  - 0 = No white support
  - 2 = White liberals only
  - 4 = Broad-based white support
- Black unemployment rate
  - 0 = 17-30%
  - 1 = 14-16%
  - 2 = 11-13%
  - 3 = 9-10%
  - 4 = 5-8%
- SES of black community
  - 1 = Nearly all lower class
  - 2 = Includes a substantial middle class (>20%)
  - 3 = Includes a substantial middle and upper class (> 20% middle class and one or more wealthy families)

Indices

- o *Objective economic status* is an additive index composed of three variables:
  - quality of central city housing
  - quality of downtown business area
  - socioeconomic status of central city residents
- o *Subjective economic status* is an additive index composed of two variables:
  - elite perceptions of city vitality
  - elite perceptions of why they promote the city
- o *Black political status* is an additive index composed of two variables:
  - political sophistication of the black community
  - white support for black candidates
- o *Black economic status* is an additive index composed of two variables:
  - black unemployment rate
  - socioeconomic status of the black communit

SCHOOL DISTRICT DEMOGRAPHICS

Single Variables

- o Total school enrollment
  - 1 = Less than 20,000
  - 2 = 20,000-100,000
  - 3 = More than 100,000
- o Percentage black enrollment
  - 1 = Less than 25%
  - 2 = 25-49%
  - 3 = More than 50%
- o Perceived financial status of the school district
  - 1 = Good to excellent
  - 2 = Good considering trends
  - 3 = Fair or poor
  - 4 = Abysmal

- Number of cutbacks made by LEA is an additive variable:
  - 1 = Cutback in pupil support services
  - 1 = Cutback in nonbasic curriculum
  - 1 = Cutback in extracurricular activities
  - 1 = Other cutbacks
  - 2 = Administrators returned to classroom teaching
  - 2 = School closings
  - 2 = Teacher hiring freeze and reduction by attrition
  - 3 = Teacher layoffs
- Percentage of total school-age children in the community enrolled in private and parochial schools
- Per pupil expenditure (standardized by dividing it by the average yearly manufacturing wage)

SCHOOL DISTRICT POLITICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Single Variables

- General public's involvement with schools
  - 1 = Low involvement
  - 3 = Moderate involvement
  - 5 = High involvement
- Perceived quality of public schools
  - 5 = Excellent
  - 4 = Good
  - 3 = Good, considering constraints
  - 2 = Fair
  - 1 = Poor
- Salience of education to business and civil elites
  - 0 = Not very salient
  - 1 = Salient
- Elite perception of relationship between school quality and their own self-interest
  - 0 = Peripheral or unrelated
  - 1 = Tied to self-interest

- o School Board disagreement on desegregation
  - 0 = No disagreement
  - 1 = Disagreement
- o Openness of school district to community inputs
  - 1 = Does not seek meaningful inputs from community groups
  - 3 = Informs community groups of new district developments
  - 4 = Routinely consults community groups on matters of concern to them
  - 5 = Includes community groups in policymaking and program design

Indices

- o *Public support for the schools* is an additive index composed of two variables:
  - general public's involvement with the schools
  - perceived quality of the public schools
- o *Elite concern for the schools* is an additive index composed of two variables:
  - salience of public education to business and civic elites
  - elite perception of relationship between school quality and their own self-interest

LOCAL DESEGREGATION CONTEXT

Single Items

- o Percent of students reassigned under mandatory aspects of desegregation plan
- o Year first stage of plan or first year of most recent pupil reassignment plan
  - 1 = 1976-1977
  - 2 = 1972-1975
  - 3 = 1963-1971
- o White perception of the inevitability of desegregation
  - 0 = NOT seen as inevitable
  - 1 = Seen as inevitable

- Mayor's public desegregation position
  - 0 = Opposes desegregation
  - 2 = No statement or neutral on desegregation ("people must obey the law")
  - 3 = Supports principle, but opposes plan for being too extensive or too fast
  - 5 = Supports principle and plan
- Superintendent's public desegregation position
  - 0 = No plan--not applicable
  - 1 = Supports principle and plan
  - 2 = Supports principle, but opposes plan for being too extensive or too fast
  - 3 = Neutral--people must obey law
  - 4 = Opposes desegregation
  - 5 = No statement
- White leaders' attitude on desegregation
  - 0 = Not applicable, desegregation not an issue
  - 1 = Opposes any type of desegregation
  - 2 = Support desegregation only if it excludes mandatory busing
  - 4 = Support desegregation which includes mandatory busing
- Status of groups supporting desegregation is an additive variable
  - 1 = Have regular involvement and exchanges with LEA
  - 1 = Receive frequent media coverage
  - 1 = Engage in organized activities
  - 1 = Have widespread public support
- Status of groups opposing desegregation is an additive variable
  - 1 = Have regular involvement and exchanges with LEA
  - 1 = Receive frequent media coverage
  - 1 = Engage in organized activities
  - 1 = Have widespread public support

Indices

- *Civic and school district leader stance toward desegregation* is an additive index composed of three variables:
  - mayor's public desegregation position
  - school superintendent's public desegregation position
  - white leaders' attitude on desegregation
- *Net community group support for desegregation* is an index based on the difference between the scores on two variables: status of groups opposing desegregation as compared with the status of those supporting desegregation

COMMUNITY GROUP RESOURCES

Single Items

- Group's annual operating budget
  - 1 = No funds
  - 2 = Below $1,000
  - 3 = $1,001-$10,000
  - 4 = $10,001-$100,000
  - 5 = $100,001-$1,000,000
  - 6 = Over $1 million
- Number of paid staff
  - 0 = No paid staff
  - 1 = 1-2 paid staff
  - 2 = 3-6 paid staff
  - 3 = 7-15 paid staff
  - 4 = 17-240 paid staff
- Group visibility
  - 1 = Not well-known in the area
  - 2 = Known only to a small stratum of people or in the group's own neighborhood
  - 3 = Known throughout the entire community

- Press coverage of group
  - 1 = Group almost never gets written up in the newspaper
  - 1 = Had private discussions with school district staff
  - 1 = Other tactics
  - 3 = Brought suit against the district
- Whether group forms coalitions with other groups pursuing similar ends
  - 0 = Never formed such a coalition or no other groups pursuing similar ends
  - 1 = Has formed such a coalition
- Whether a group delivers educational services
  - 0 = Group does not deliver educational services
  - 1 = Group delivers educational services (including assistance to gifted students, provision of career information, development of new curriculum materials, counseling on suspensions or expulsions, furthering intercultural understanding, general educational enrichment, provision of minority-relevant courses, and provision of extracurricular activities)
- Whether a group engages in advocacy-type activities
  - 0 = Group does not engage in advocacy-type activities
  - 1 = Group engages in advocacy-type activities (including dissemination of information, improvement of school-community relations, attempts to get more local control of schools, attempts to increase community inputs into school decisionmaking, attempts to have nonminority staff hired or promoted, attempts to influence school site selection or school closings)
- Whether a group engages in desegregation-specific activities
  - 0 = Group does not engage in desegregation-specific activity
  - 1 = Group engages in desegregation-specific activity (including filing suit against the district, attempts to influence content or timing of desegregation plan, and attempts to reduce white flight)

2 = Group receives occasional local press coverage

3 = Group receives frequent local press coverage

- o Independent influence of organizational leader
  - 0 = Leader has little or no independent influence
  - 1 = Leader has substantial influence
- o Source of major organizational funding
  - 0 = Governmental (including all federal, state and local governmental sources)
  - 1 = Private sources (including dues, private foundation support, donations, and fund-raising activities)
- o Whether a group has members
  - 0 = Group has no members
  - 1 = Group has members

Indices

- o *Level of material resources* is an additive index composed of two variables:
  - current annual operating budget
  - number of paid staff
- o *Level of nonmaterial resources* is an additive index composed of three variables:
  - level of group leader influence
  - group visibility
  - group press coverage

COMMUNITY GROUP CHOICE OF TACTICS AND ACTIVITIES

Single Variables

- o What a group has done in the event of disagreement with school district policy is an additive variable
  - 0 = Group has a policy of not getting involved with school district policy or there has never been such a disagreement
  - 1 = Spoken at school board meetings
  - 1 = Written letters to the school board or media

Indices

- o *Group tactics* is an additive index composed of two variables:
  - what a group has done in the event of disagreement with school district policy
  - whether a group has formed coalitions